

ALASKA'S INCLUSION IN THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1956,
THE WORK OF THE BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS AND
THE TRANSITION TO STATEHOOD

FINAL REPORT

by

Claus-M. Naske, Ph.D.
Professor of History
University of Alaska, Fairbanks
Fairbanks, Alaska 99775

Report AK-RD-87-31

July 1987

ALASKA'S INCLUSION IN THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1956,
THE WORK OF THE BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS AND
THE TRANSITION TO STATEHOOD

FINAL REPORT

by

Claus-M. Naske, Ph.D.
Professor of History
University of Alaska, Fairbanks

July 1987

Prepared for:

State of Alaska
Department of Transportation and Public Facilities
Division of Planning and Research
2301 Peger Road
Fairbanks, Alaska 99701

RSA No. 87NP027 between DOT&PF and
the University of Alaska, Fairbanks

The contents of the report reflect the view of the author who is responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities. This report does not constitute a standard, specification or regulation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Alaska's Inclusion in the Federal-Aid Highway Act.....	1
2	The Transition from the Alaska Road Commission to the Bureau of Public Roads.....	39
3	The Plan for a Taku River Valey Road.....	87
4	Fitting Alaska Into the Federal-Aid Highway System.....	115
5	Transportation and the Northern Economy, Adapting the 1956 FAHA to the Territory and the Creation of the Alaska Department of Highways & Public Works.....	165
6	Planning for a Southeastern Alaska Ferry System.....	259
7	The Bureau of Public Roads Deals with Alaskan Conditions.....	293
8	Alaska Statehood and the Transition.....	325
9	Region 10 Under Contract to the State and a Slow Phase-Out.....	355

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This is the continuation of a research project which I undertook several years ago for DOT&PF. I delivered the final report in June, 1983, entitled Alaska Road Commission Historical Narrative. Subsequently, the Alaska Historical Commission provided an editing and a pre-publication grant. The University Press of America, Inc. of Lanham, Maryland accepted the revised manuscript for publication and it was published in November 1986 entitled Paving Alaska's Trails: The Work of the Alaska Road Commission. The present report continues the narrative from 1956 to 1959.

Once again, I am indebted to numerous individuals who unstintingly aided the project. University of Alaska, Fairbanks Archivist Paul H. McCarthy and archival assistant Renee Blahuta helped with their knowledge of the materials in the collections. Archivists at the National Archives and the Washington Federal Records Center in Suitland, Maryland immeasurably aided my efforts, particularly Franklin W. Burch and Robert M. Kvasnicka of the former institution and Jack Saunders of the latter. Frank Rubis of the Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation made the pertinent records in Suitland available. Joyce Justice, Archivist at the Seattle Federal Records Center, helped me find the appropriate records in that depository. Sheri Layral, administrative assistant with the History Department, rendered critical assistance in the production of this report as in many previous ones. She typed and revised several versions of each chapter with great skill, speed, and patience, and helped with the editing.

I thank everyone for their contributions. An author cannot be entirely saved from his own errors and omissions, and I acknowledge my responsibility for any that remain.

ALASKA'S INCLUSION IN THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT

The late governor and U.S. Senator from Alaska, Ernest Gruening devoted a chapter in his 1954 volume entitled The State of Alaska to transportation. The Chapter, "Transportation: Tangled Life Lines" examined Alaska's shipping, air transportation, highways, and railroad. According to Gruening, Hugh Peterson (D., Georgia) the chairman of the House Committee on Territories and also a member of the House Committee on Roads reported in 1946 that "the principal reason for the failure of Congress to extend the provisions" of the Federal Aid Road Act of 1916* and its amendments to Alaska was probably the fact that the territory's vast size "would entitle it to an unduly large share of the total appropriation made under the act." This official pronouncement, Gruening noted, "confirmed what Alaskans had long known and had long vainly sought to change, with legislature after legislature memorializing Congress and Alaska's delegates introducing bills in each Congress for that purpose." Congress had extended the provisions of the Federal Aid Highway Act to Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia since their land area was small. Thus they shared in the hundreds of millions of dollars appropriated for annual expenditure as highway aid. Alaska had always been excluded because it was too vast. Congress did not consider that Alaska's needs were correspondingly vast.¹

* The name of the original bill was titled Federal Aid Road Act of 1916, future references and bills use the title Federal Aid Highway Act. In this chapter Federal Aid Highway Act will be used to refer to both.

Still, Alaskans paid all the taxes, including the 2-cent federal gas tax (a rate prevailing in 1954) which beneficiaries of the federal-aid legislation paid. Indeed, Gruening calculated that if Alaska had not been excluded from the Federal Aid Highway program since its enactment in 1916, the territory's share would have exceeded \$350 million, and Alaska's past contributions would have come very close to equaling the matching required.²

Early in 1945, Alaska's newly-elected delegate to Congress, E.L. "Bob" Bartlett, introduced an amendment to the Federal Aid Highway Act intended to include the territory in its benefit. In order to forestall Congressional opposition, the delegate's measure specified that only one-half of Alaska's land area be used in the calculations to determine the allocation of such funds. The bill also provided that the administrator of the Federal Works Agency and the Territorial Board of Road Commissioners were to determine and agree upon the road systems on which federal funds were to be expended, and that these monies also be available for the maintenance of the road system.³

Federal Aid Highway Act funds were apportioned by the following formula: one-third on the basis of the ratio of the population of the state to the total U.S. population; another one-third to be expended on the basis of the ratio of the road mileage of the state to the total U.S. mileage; one-third of the funds to be expended on the basis of the ratio of the area of the state to the total area of the U.S. The 1940 census gave the U.S. a population of 131,699,275 and Alaska 72,524, a ratio too small to consider. The total road mileage of the U.S. was approximately 1,700,000 miles, Alaska's 2,750 a ratio also too small to consider. The combined area of the contiguous states, Puerto Rico and Hawaii amounted to

3,032,242 square miles. Adding Alaska's 586,400 square miles gave a total of 3,612,642 square miles, or an Alaskan share of about 16 percent. Based on the above formula and the Bartlett proposal that only one-half of Alaska's land area be used in apportioning funds, Alaska would be eligible to one-half of 16 percent, or 8 percent of one-third of the federal appropriations. The actual Alaska allotment, however, would be the amount the territory was able to match under the formula prescribed in the Federal Aid Highway Act. The postwar act of December 20, 1944 authorized the expenditure of \$500 million per annum for three years following the end of the war. Of this sum, \$125 million was to be spent in "urban areas." Alaska did not qualify because it had no such areas as defined in the act. It would, however, participate in the apportionment of the remaining \$375 million. Its possible share of about 8 percent of one-third of \$375 million would be about \$10,150,000. Delegate Bartlett thought, however, that this was more money than the territory would be able to match for years to come, even though the matching formula was \$14 federal to \$1 territorial. Another feature of the Bartlett bill allowed the territory to use Federal Aid Highway Act funds for maintenance of roads. This was a special provision because Alaska's climatic and physical factors necessitated an intensive maintenance program after construction in order to stabilize the roadbed and forestall early deterioration. Therefore, both the federal contribution as well as the territorial match were to be expendable for maintenance as well as construction work. Bartlett estimated that annual maintenance expenses amounted to between \$750,000 to \$1,000,000, and with continued expansion of the road network were bound to increase. In the contiguous states, Puerto Rico and Hawaii, federal and matching funds could be used for construction only.⁴

The Bartlett bill also provided that the Office of the Territorial Highway Engineer, established in 1921, become a highway department responsible for construction and maintenance. Under existing arrangements, it selected the projects for which funds appropriated by the territorial legislature were to be spent. The Alaska Road Commission, a federal agency in the Department of the Interior, performed the construction and maintenance work. Bartlett estimated that the new operating agency would cost the territory approximately \$400,000 per annum. The delegate thought that the territory might be able to raise \$400,000 in matching funds per annum which would entitle it to a federal grant of \$5.3 million.⁵ Congress, however, did not pass the Bartlett amendment.

On July 15, 1947, Secretary of the Interior Julius A. "Cap" Krug wrote speaker of the House, Joseph W. Martin, that his department and the Public Roads Administration had discussed Alaska's postwar highway problems and needs. Both agreed that in order to foster the territory's economic growth, its highways and roads needed to be substantially improved and expanded. Krug, much interested in fostering territorial economic, social, and political development, recognized that the federal government had discriminated against Alaska since 1916 by excluding it from the benefits of the Federal Aid Highway Act of that year. Federal funds for roads in Alaska had been provided through items in the Department's yearly appropriations for the work of the Alaska Road Commission. The practical effects of this distinction in treatment between Alaska and the rest of the nation was that federal road funds granted Alaska had been consistently much less in amount and more uncertain from year to year than those it would have received as a participant in the Federal Aid Highway Act.⁶

Krug submitted a draft bill modeled on the Bartlett proposal, namely the provision to use only one-half of Alaska's land area in benefit calculations; Alaska was to receive not less than \$7.5 million annually, and the territorial contribution was to be not less than 10 percent of the federal funds it received each year. Alaska, however, was to get credit for that portion of receipts from occupation and trade licenses collected in the territory and used for road building under the existing law relating to the so-called "Alaska Fund." The territory was to be allowed to use federal and matching monies for construction and maintenance, and it also was to be allowed to build suitable connections with Canadian roads in order to provide desirable international routes, subject to appropriate agreements between the two governments. Krug also suggested that the Alaska Road Commission be abolished and its functions transferred to the Public Roads Administration.⁷ Despite secretarial endorsement and the blessing of the Bureau of the Budget, Congress once again failed to include Alaska within the benefits of the Federal Aid Highway Act.

On July 30, 1948, Secretary Krug announced plans for a greatly expanded road building program for Alaska. Having been unsuccessful in persuading Congress to include Alaska in the Federal Aid Highway Act, Krug now linked the road program to military needs first, and economic development second. The secretary had consulted with the Air Force, Department of the Army and the Public Roads Administration. Out of these consultations had emerged a comprehensive plan already presented to Congress which called for the reconstruction and paving of Alaska's trunk highway system, especially those roads serving the principal military installations as well as areas of economic importance. Krug stated that the lack of an adequate transportation system had greatly retarded Alaska's economic development. The

territory had once again become an important military bastion for the defense of North America, and therefore an improvement of transportation facilities had become a priority. To start the program, Congress had appropriated \$17,904,000. This compared to annual federal expenditures for Alaska of about \$4 million for the past several years. In order to get the road building underway, Krug had made arrangements to augment the staff of the Alaska Road Commission.⁸

Actually, it had been the Army which had told Krug in October 1947 that the limited capacity of the Alaska Railroad and the deficiencies of "the road system in mainland Alaska jeopardize the mission of National Defense." The Army considered the support of its bases in the North and the development of new sources of strategic raw materials vital necessities for effective national defense. These two requirements depended on the existence of a road and railroad system "not only adequate for peacetime use but capable of sustaining the increased traffic which an emergency would impose." As a result, within a year, Congress approved a massive six-year road development program for Alaska blessed by the Army, costing in excess of \$125 million. Between 1905 and 1948, Congress appropriated \$38,696,545 for Alaskan road, trail, and bridge construction and maintenance. In contrast, between 1949 and 1955, it appropriated \$135,395,031. In other words, in the short span of 6 years, Congress appropriated more than three times as much as it had in the previous 43 years put together.⁹

By 1955, President Dwight D. Eisenhower had proposed a 10 year road program for the United States. Alaska wanted to be included. Delegate Bartlett requested Irving Reed, the Territorial Highway Engineer and Superintendent of Public Works to testify before the Senate Committee on Public Works and tell the lawmakers why Alaska should be included in the

program. Reed testified on March 15, 1955. He stated that the territory's participation fell into three categories. The first required the construction of four-lane highways from the military installations in Anchorage and Fairbanks through the municipalities and the improvement of existing two-lane highways around these bases. The second consisted of the construction and continuation of the Alaska and Richardson Highways on to Nome. The third concerned the construction and paving for military use and civilian defense of roads lying mainly in northwestern Canada. Reed thought that this work would necessitate negotiations and treaties with Canada. He estimated that the cost of construction in the first category would amount to approximately \$60,740,000; in the second to about \$21,000,000, and the third, excluding the Canadian roads, \$11,500,000. The total bill came to \$93,240,000, or to approximately \$9,324,000 per annum, "a not too heavy burden considering the necessity of the roads..." Reed concluded his presentation.¹⁰ He did not address the question of whether or not Alaska should be included in the Federal Aid Highway Act.

Territorial officials were afraid that with the end of the 6 year road building program in 1955, Congress would once again neglect Alaska. Many territorial residents and their delegate once again contemplated the chances of having Congress include Alaska in the Federal Aid Highway Act. Businessman Everett P. Wood of Yukon Equipment, Inc. thought the time opportune to suggest Alaska's inclusion. He doubted that the territory would be allowed to participate in Eisenhower's proposed 10 year program. After having consulted extensively with officials of the Alaska Road Commission, the highway committees of several Alaska Chambers of Commerce, the Alaska Legislative Council, the governor and members of the territorial legislature, the Territorial Board of Road Commissioners as well as many

interested individuals, Wood had drafted a measure for Alaska's inclusion in the Federal Aid Highway Act. His proposal differed from the Bartlett bill of 1945 and the Krug measure of 1947 in that all of Alaska's land area was to be used in computing the territory's annual entitlement under the Act even though it might be unable to fully match it; that the unmatched funds were to be used only on projects needed for national defense; that 90 percent of the proceeds of all special taxes on motor transportation be earmarked for the administrative and operating expenses of a territorial highway department as well as the maintenance of the territorial highway system; and that the Secretary of Agriculture was to select those projects which would complete a highway system adequate for national defense. Bartlett acknowledged the proposal, but confided to John E. Croul, Jr., the manager of the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce that he was none too eager to introduce such a measure "until there has been general agreement on the subject. It would bring us obvious advantages; at the same time it would bring us costs we do not now have." Bartlett agreed that Alaska's inclusion in the program "must indeed be our goal" but he insisted that there had to "be a broader basis for support than is now apparent." The delegate thereupon contacted a broad range of his constituents in order to learn about their desires in this matter.¹¹

In the meantime, the Senate debated a couple of measures providing highway aid to the states. During the debate, Senator Richard L. Neuberger (D., Oregon) criticized the exclusion of Alaska from both bills. Neuberger had served as a U.S. Army officer in Alaska during the war and formed friendships with Ernest Gruening and E.L. Bartlett. He had maintained an active interest in northern affairs, and in this instance used language Delegate Bartlett had supplied. Neuberger found it curious that Alaska, of

vital military strategic importance to the United States, did not receive any federal highway aid. He had hoped that his colleagues would finally recognize the discrimination Alaska had suffered for such a long time by exclusion from the Federal Aid Highway Act and remedy the situation by including the territory. Out of military necessity Congress had appropriated large funds to the Alaska Road Commission in recent years. "But for many years before that," he continued, "the road funds appropriated were infinitesimal compared with what Alaska would have received if the Federal-aid highway program had been extended to that great Territory." The funds allotted to the Alaska Road Commission out of military necessity had declined drastically. Therefore, the time had come "when serious consideration should be given to bring Alaska under the Federal-aid highway program." It should not be too difficult to devise a formula allowing the territory to participate on an equitable basis with the states and Hawaii and Puerto Rico in the Federal Aid Highway Act.¹²

Senator Spessard L. Holland (D., Florida), although sympathetic to Alaska's needs and Neuberger's pleas, maintained that the territory had been excluded merely to treat it more generously than simply another state. He pointed out that the apportionment formula for federal aid highway funds included existing road mileage and population, both inadequate to give Alaska a fair share. The third factor in the formula considered the amount of public domain. In Alaska, about 98 percent of the land belonged in that category. Apportioning money based on the public domain would entitle Alaska to huge amounts of federal aid highway funds, totally "out of balance with the developmental actualities, as well as the needs..." of Alaska. Therefore, the territory had always been given a separate public roads program, additional funds for forest roads, and public works bills

which made it possible to build badly needed roads in the small communities on a 50 percent matching basis. In short, Holland believed it to be in Alaska's interest to be treated separately from the contiguous states.¹³

While the Senate had debated the two highway measures, Bartlett began receiving replies from his constituents about Alaska's inclusion in the FAHA. Irving Reed, Alaska's Highway Engineer and Superintendent of Public Works had ducked the question in his previous Senate testimony. In June 1955 he told Bartlett that he had studied the problem carefully, talked to many knowledgeable Alaskans, including territorial Governor B. Frank Heintzleman, and concluded that, unless it could be arranged to use federal funds to maintain territorial roads, Alaska's participation "would be a tragic mistake." Furthermore, during his last visit to Washington, D.C. Reed had talked to Captain C.D. Curtiss, the commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads, about Alaska's possible inclusion under the FAHA. Curtiss had told him that, should Alaska participate, the Bureau of Public Roads would take over the Alaska Road Commission, "lock, stock and barrel." Reed asked Bartlett to make certain that this did not happen. Rather, the territory "should inherit the Alaska Road Commission and its equipment."¹⁴

In early November 1955, the Alaska Chamber of Commerce held its annual convention in Fairbanks. Governor Heintzleman delivered the opening address. He dealt with many problems, including the need for the speedy construction of additional main highways, secondary and access roads. He urged chamber members to lobby Congress to have the territory included in the FAHA, but cautioned that because "of the great need and sparse population, Alaska will require federal aid for maintenance as well." Among the resolutions adopted at the end of the convention was one which stated that the chamber continued to favor Alaska's inclusion in the FAHA under a

formula providing funds to the Alaska Road Commission for maintenance of federally constructed roads.¹⁵

In the meantime, Bartlett had begun the long process of information gathering and research required to prepare the necessary legislation and steer it through Congress. He inquired of Commissioner Curtiss whether or not the Alaska Territorial Board of Road Commissioners qualified as a highway department under the terms of the FAHA, for these organizations elsewhere, suitably organized, were the recipients of the federal highway funds. Curtiss equivocated, merely stating that if Alaska was included, the appropriate territorial officials would have to convince the Bureau of Public Roads that the highway organization designated by the Alaska legislature was capable of fulfilling its responsibilities according to the applicable provisions of the Federal Aid Highway Act legislation. Everett P. Wood, a strong proponent of Alaska's inclusion, thought that the Territorial Board of Road Commissioners did not meet the necessary qualifications. He pointed out that, if included, the Alaska Road Commission would become superfluous. He urged Bartlett to include language in the proposed legislation to have the very substantial assets as well as the functioning organization of this federal department transferred to the territory. It would endow Alaska with a ready-made highway department at a minimum cost to the territorial taxpayers.¹⁶

Bartlett had hoped to meet with Governor Heintzleman during the latter's visit to the capital city in December 1955, and had received assurances that such a meeting would make place. Much to his chagrin, however, the delegate discovered that the governor had left town without contacting him. Bartlett was frustrated. He reminded Heintzleman that "on several occasions in Alaska during the summer and fall we spoke about the

necessity of our getting together to devise a formula relating to the highway program which would meet Alaska's needs and at the same time be cognizant of financial contributions to the program which Alaska would have to make." The delegate had learned that Heintzleman had met with officials of the Bureau of Public Roads "and received scant encouragement there." Officials had told the governor that they feared that once the highway matter was brought before Congress that body might compel Alaska to be included in the FAHA on exactly the same terms as the states and Hawaii and Puerto Rico. This, of course, would mean that the territory would have to pick up the maintenance tab in the amount of several million dollars annually as well as paying about 12.5 percent matching funds for new construction. Bartlett had hoped that Republican Heintzleman would present a suitable formula to the Eisenhower administration and gain its support. He was convinced that if leading officials of the administration supported Alaska's inclusion under appropriate terms, he could present the case to Congress without fear of having that body "force us into any situation inimical to Alaska's best interests."¹⁷

Heintzleman was surprised at Bartlett's reaction and assured him that he had failed to realize the importance the delegate had attached to the projected meeting. Had he not been "working on twenty-five or more different problems scattered through a score of departments and offices, I would have called you regardless of the road matter." He told Bartlett that he had learned nothing new from the Bureau of Public Roads "that you and I haven't known for the five years or more we have been working together on this project...." The governor planned to return to the capital in January 1956 and then work with the delegate. He reported to Bartlett on his December 1955 meeting with Frank DuPont, the commissioner of the Bureau of

Public Roads, who had told him that it was a waste of time trying to include special provisions for Alaska in the FAHA; that if Alaska was given federal funds under the act for road maintenance, the states and territories would immediately demand the same treatment, "and because of this prospect Congress would turn us down flat." DuPont had asserted that the states would oppose any sharing of highway funds with Alaska, even though the territory's portion would be very small, particularly since state officials were aware that Alaska had long received federal road funds from other sources. In short, DuPont opposed any extension of the act to Alaska with special modifications, as did Assistant Secretary of the Department of Commerce Louis S. Rothschild, in charge of Bureau of Public Roads affairs and Under Secretary of Commerce Walter Williams. Heintzleman was troubled by a press conference where Bartlett apparently had told reporters that a bipartisan effort to get the Eisenhower administration to support inclusion of Alaska in a new federal highway aid bill "appeared to have all but collapsed this week in the wake of an open rift between" the delegate and the governor. Heintzleman denied any such rift, and he proposed that the two men again discuss alternatives they had considered in the past. The governor referred to Bartlett's 1945 proposed amendment to the FAHA, previously mentioned, as well as the idea to add the Alaska Highway to the International Highway System, stretching from Fairbanks to the southeast end of South America. This would make Alaska eligible for Congressional appropriations along with Mexico, the central American republics and other countries along the route. Still another proposal involved having Alaska's main highway system designated "Military Highways." If approved, the Alaska Road Commission would receive funds from military appropriations to meet the cost of repair, maintenance, and extensions.¹⁸

A few days later, Wood of Yukon Equipment, Inc., who had made Alaska's inclusion into the FAHA a major lobbying goal, wrote to six senators and four house members involved with highway legislation, as well as several administration officials, Chambers of Commerce of all Alaskan towns and various territorial newspapers in order to gain support for the cause. He pointed out that Alaska should be included in the FAHA since territorial residents were American citizens and paid the federal fuel tax like everybody else. Appropriating funds for the work of the Alaska Road Commission on a year to year basis was awkward and unpredictable, resulting in wide fluctuations and making any long-range planning impossible. Also, a territorial highway department should perform the functions of the Alaska Road Commission. Wood reasoned that since the military used territorial roads extensively, Congress should make additional provisions for federal participation in the maintenance of these highways. He submitted a proposed draft amendment for discussion purposes which embodied his ideas. He asked Bartlett to help prepare a specific program for attaining the goal and work to get the best possible bill through Congress. The delegate appreciated Wood's efforts, and reiterated his belief that a coordinate effort was essential to achieve the goal. This included a determination on the part of the administration to include Alaska on acceptable terms and the difficult job of securing Congressional acquiescence. In fact, Bartlett insisted that "we must press forward in an all-out effort to be 'included in' instead of finding ourselves 'included out' next year as we were this."¹⁹

Both Anchorage newspapers published editorials dealing with the issue. The Times stated that 1955 was ending "on a sour note" because the federal government had steadfastly refused to budge from its practice of excluding

the territory from the national highway programs. Heintzleman had received no encouragement from Washington, and the special appropriations for the Alaska Road Commission were drying up. The editor reminded his readers that during 88 years of American ownership, a mere 3,500 miles of highways had been built in the huge northern landmass. And since the federal government owned 99 percent of Alaska's land, road building clearly was a federal responsibility. 1956 would mark the fortieth year since Congress had passed the first Federal Aid Highway Act. Under its provisions the nation's road system had been revamped and expanded. Hawaii and Puerto Rico had participated in the program--but Alaska had been excluded. The Anchorage Daily News asked the delegate to make every effort to have Alaska included in 1956, but reminded the citizens that their help was essential in achieving this goal. This help should take the form of writing letters to members of Congress. The editor urged potential lobbyists to ask lawmakers to make provisions for federal participation in maintenance. The Anchorage Chamber of Congress prepared a lengthy brief explaining why Alaska should be included. Widely distributed, it traced the history of road construction in Alaska and showed the fluctuating levels of funding which had made planning impossible.²⁰

Early in January 1956, Delegate Bartlett contact his old friend, Senator Warren G. Magnuson (D., Washington) in efforts to enlist his aid in pushing legislation through Congress including Alaska in the FAHA. The delegate summarized the existing system and then told the Senator that Alaska could not afford to be included in the FAHA "under terms of full equality," that, indeed, it required "some kind of special consideration," because without it Alaska would have to pay annual maintenance expenses of about \$14 million with additional construction contributions amounting to

about 13.5 percent of the total federal contribution. Alaska paid "a dreadful penalty for not being in the system," he continued, because for the current fiscal year Congress had appropriated \$6.3 million to the Alaska Road Commission for construction--but had Alaska been included in the FAHA it would receive fully \$27.9 million annually. Bartlett reminded Magnuson that under the provisions of S. 1048, which had passed the Senate in May, 1955, the territory's construction share would have amounted to \$37.8 million annually, while under H.R. 7474, which failed to pass the House, it would have amounted to \$35.3 million annually. Inclusion in the FAHA not only made available large amounts of construction monies, but for the first time would allow programming continuity impossible under the fluctuating Interior Department appropriations. Unfortunately, the administration had not even attempted to include Alaska in the FAHA. Bartlett had testified before the Senate and House committees on the measures but without effect. Perhaps that was not quite correct, because when the House committee revised the Senate bill, the additional taxes imposed to raise the necessary revenues were extended to Alaska as well--although territorial residents would have received no benefits at all. Unfortunately, Governor Heintzleman, a representative of the Administration, had failed to work out a satisfactory formula with Bartlett. Still, Interior officials had promised to devise a satisfactory formula, but so far had failed to make good on that commitment. In short, Bartlett needed help and he hoped that Magnuson would "get in the fight" for Alaska. Bartlett suggested that "we can surrender much and still gain much." The delegate then suggested a formula for the Senator's use: give Alaska half the construction money it would be entitled to if included in the FAHA, specifically \$15 million annually for construction and maintenance; waive the maintenance

requirements for the territory; require that the territorial legislature contribute \$2.5 million annually to be used together with federal funds for construction or maintenance; transfer the functions of the Alaska Road Commission to the Bureau of Public Roads; eliminate the special provisions for Alaska after 10 years.²¹

Bartlett knew that even if a special Alaskan formula could be agreed upon, "a tremendous selling job will have to be done with the Congress and the administration too. Neither has expressed any monumental interest in the territory's position. The Department of the Interior pointed out that territorial revenues from highway users' taxes amounted to only a little over \$2 million annually while approximately \$5 to \$10 million were required to permit Alaska to pay its portion of highway construction and maintenance costs as required under the FAHA."²²

On January 26, 1956, Representative George H. Fallon (D., Maryland) introduced a measure to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Highway Act. The bill authorized the appropriation of \$25 million for the fiscal year 1957 in addition to any other funds for that year; \$750 million for the fiscal year 1958, and \$775 million for the fiscal year 1959. Fallon proposed to increase the total annual appropriations by \$25 million each year beginning in the fiscal year 1960 and ending on June 30, 1969. It was the intent of Congress to accelerate the construction of a safe and efficient system of federal aid highways in each state, consisting of projects on the federal aid primary and secondary systems and approved extensions in urban areas. Fallon's measure also declared that it was essential to the national interest to complete the "National System of Interstate Highways." Because of its primary importance to the national defense, the name of the system was changed to the "National System of

Interstate and Defense Highways," or the National System, for short. In order to expedite the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of the National System, the bill appropriated \$1.025 billion for the fiscal year 1957 in addition to the authorization made for that year, another \$1.7 billion for fiscal year 1958, and additional sums exceeding \$2 billion for the fiscal years from 1959 through 1967, dropping to below \$2 billion between fiscal years 1968 and 1969.²³ Fallon's measure made no mention of Alaska, however, and the territory once again was to be excluded from this federal bounty.

Delegate Bartlett applauded the decision by leaders of both parties in Congress to launch a large highway building program. He saw no fault in the plan to have highway users pay for the program, but could not understand why Alaska had not been included. The Washington Daily News came to the delegate's aid on January 28 with an editorial which stated that "no area under the American flag is in greater need of roads and highways." Territorial citizens were to pay the extra taxes levied for the new road program, in addition to every other tax paid by the inhabitants of the 48 contiguous states. The Department of the Interior had constructed all but the military roads. A total of 3,784 miles of highway had been built. In comparison, Nevada, with but little more population and a far smaller area, boasted of 25,000 miles of roads. It also was included in the FAHA. The editor observed that Interior had asked for less than \$8 million for fiscal year 1957, about a third of the amount spent for a few years before the Korean War when the military had demanded an adequate road construction program in the territory. The editor concluded by urging Congress and the administration to include Alaska in FAHA, but under a formula recognizing the territory's limited financial resources. Delegate Bartlett followed

the editorial with a specific proposal of how to include Alaska in the FAHA. He suggested that the Department of the Interior turn over its Alaska Road Commission to the Bureau of Public Roads in the Department of Commerce. The territory should receive between \$17.5 to \$20 million per year under FAHA, to be used for both construction and maintenance. The territory should contribute 13.5 percent of the federal allocation. After 10 years, the special formula would end and Alaska participate on an equal basis with all the other states in the FAHA.²⁴

In the meantime, a delegation of Alaska majors and city managers had arrived in Washington, D.C. in early 1956 and lobbied Congress to include the territory in the FAHA. Bartlett and former Governor Ernest Gruening had talked with members of the Senate Public Works Committee and mustered considerable support for Alaska's cause, while the director of the Office of Territories tried to enlist the aid of the White House. A few days later, on February 21, 1956, Assistant Secretary of the Interior Wesley A. D'Ewart testified before the Roads Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee on the current Federal Aid Highway Act designed to stimulate the construction of needed highways and to make the federal aid highway system safer and more efficient. The measure, however, did not cover Alaska. D'Ewart reminded the lawmakers that when legislation was proposed to Congress early in 1955, it had been deemed desirable to handle Alaska road problems separately from those elsewhere in the nation. At the time, territorial revenues from highway user taxes were so small that they contributed but little toward meeting Alaska's road needs. Since then, however, the territorial legislature had increased the motor fuel tax from 2¢ to 5¢ per gallon. "Partly for that reason, and on the basis of further study," he continued, the Department of the Interior had concluded "that

cognizance should be taken of the Alaska situation in any general national highway legislation, even though the problem in Alaska must be handled in a different manner." D'Ewart therefore proposed that a section be inserted in the bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior "to develop and carry out a program for the accelerated construction of highways within Alaska." For the coming fiscal year, Interior had requested \$7.8 million for construction and a little more than \$3.6 million for maintenance for the Alaska Road Commission. Unfortunately, the Territorial Board of Road Commissioners expected to collect only slightly more than \$2 million from highway user taxes, insufficient even for maintenance costs, let alone territorial matches for federal aid grants. It was for this reason that Alaska had never been included in the FAHA, D'Ewart reasoned. And although the present system was less than completely satisfactory, Interior believed that Alaska was willing to assume a larger share of the responsibility for its own highway system, particularly the maintenance costs. D'Ewart asked Congress to approve an expanded highway construction program for the territory. In case Congress reacted favorably, Interior planned to ask the territory to make larger financial contributions than in the past for the construction and maintenance of Alaska's highway system. Interior and the Territorial Board of Road Commissioners would decide jointly the roads to be selected for construction and maintenance.²⁵

At the end of February, Delegate Bartlett followed D'Ewart before the same subcommittee and urged that Alaska be included in the FAHA. He offered an amendment to achieve this which provided that in determining the basis of federal aid highway funds, only one-half of Alaska's land mass be used in the area apportionment factor of such funds. The territory was to contribute no less than 10 percent of federal funds allocated annually.

The territorial monies were to be deposited in a special U.S. Treasury account for use in conjunction with the allotted federal funds. Alaska's governor, the Territorial Highway Engineer, and the Secretary of Commerce were to select the roads where these monies were to be expended, and both funds were to be spent without regard to the matching provisions of FAHA since the delegate feared that Alaska would be unable to raise the required matching funds. Most importantly, both territorial and federal monies could be used for construction as well as maintenance. In addition, the functions and personnel of the Alaska Road Commission were to be transferred to the Bureau of Public Roads in the Department of Commerce. Bartlett asked his friend, Senator Richard Neuberger for help when the federal aid highway legislation reached that body. He confided to the Senator that the House was unlikely to accept his amendment since the administration had not endorsed the concept. The delegate considered D'Ewart's proposed amendment, namely to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to develop and carry out an accelerated highway construction program, totally useless because it was couched in such general terms. Bartlett believed, however, that Interior would not oppose his amendment, and midlevel bureaucrats in the Bureau of Public Roads unofficially endorsed it while higher officials in the Department of Commerce were unwilling to have Alaska included in the FAHA. In the final analysis, it was Bartlett's opinion that "our best and last hope, perhaps, will lie with the Senate Committee on Public Works." Whatever Neuberger could do "we shall deeply appreciate...and if successful later on the floor of the Senate to get the Alaska Road program moving in high gear."²⁶

As the delegate had feared, the House Public Works Committee rejected the amendment which a colleague and friend had introduced on Bartlett's

behalf. On April 26, the delegate complained to the House Public Works Committee that Alaska had once again not been included in the FAHA. The contiguous states as well as Puerto Rico and Hawaii gained from the proposed legislation. All Americans were to pay additional taxes to support these benefits, including Alaska's residents, "but their taxes will go to pay for roads elsewhere." The delegate appreciated the efforts of those who tried to include the territory "which would have given Alaskans roads together with taxes instead of just taxes without roads...." Bartlett painted a picture of Congressional neglect of Alaska's transportation needs. After 89 years as an American possession, the territory possessed less than 4,000 miles "of roads of all sorts and descriptions." In fact, "between 1920 and 1940...we had only about 250 miles of new roads--and these of the pioneer type--built..." and "a few hundred miles of new roads were added in the following decade but now new construction has virtually ceased." Had the federal government "deliberately decided to maintain Alaska as a wilderness, it could not have chosen a more effective means than to make sure no roads were built." Bartlett continued that these facts furnished "shocking proof of the failure of the system we have been using, and is proof likewise of the terrible neglect which Alaska has suffered." Instead of having been treated as an organized, incorporated territory of the United States and a constitutional member of the Union, it had been regarded as "a distant, unwanted, uncared for colony." Bartlett summarized the history of transportation in Alaska for his listeners, and concluded that he hoped that the Senate would include the territory in the FAHA. A few days later, the Washington Post editorialized that "it must seem a bitter irony to Alaskans that only a few days after adopting a widely praised state constitution, their territory was again reminded of

its semicolonial status" when the Congress, as in the past, denied it highway benefits. Alaskans were not, however, "exempted from taxation for roads," estimating that "they will pay \$700,000 next year in additional gasoline taxes to support highway construction elsewhere." The editor hoped that the Senate would "amend the highway bill to give Alaska a fair break."²⁷

Bartlett and those who supported Alaska's inclusion in the FAHA now turned their attention to the Senate. On May 5, the Washington Daily News reported that neither the Senate nor the House version of the highway legislation included Alaska, "except, of course, that Alaskans will be required to pay the same extra taxes as inhabitants of the contiguous states. In fact Congress never fails to remember Alaska when voting taxes. Alaskans pay every Federal tax we do." The paper suggested that the Senate speedily correct this injustice by appropriate amendments. A few days later, the Senate Committee on Public Works recommended that the full body pass the House version of the bill except that it substitute the 1955 Senate version for title I of the House measure. This bill contained the program for the National System of Interstate Highways extended to cover a period of 13 years, but it also launched a vast new program for improving and modernizing the Interstate System. Senator Neuberger notified his colleagues that he planned to sponsor an amendment to bring Alaska within the provisions of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956. He intended to modify the formula so that the territory's large landmass "will not make disproportionate the benefits thus conferred."²⁸

On May 17, Senator Neuberger submitted an amendment authorizing the inclusion of Alaska in the FAHA of 1956 "on the same terms and conditions as the several States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, insofar as expenditure for

projects on the Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban systems is concerned." The Senator had taken Bartlett's proposed amendment to the House bill and submitted it without change. As will be recalled, it used only 50 percent of Alaska's acreage in the area factor for the apportionment of funds; had the territory contribute no less than 10 percent of the federal funds apportioned each fiscal year; and transferred all road functions from the various agencies to the Bureau of Public Roads.²⁹ Neuberger had not mentioned the crucial matter of using federal funds for construction and maintenance.

In the meantime, Bartlett lobbied friends and acquaintances in the Senate, asking that they support the Neuberger amendment. On May 28, Senator Neuberger called up his amendment to include Alaska in the FAHA. It included language allowing Alaska to use federal funds for construction as well as maintenance. A lively debate about Alaska's proposed inclusion in the FAHA ensued. Senator Francis H. Case (R., South Dakota) suggested that Neuberger limit to 33.3 percent the area of Alaska considered for determining apportionment of federal funds since a large part of Alaska was uninhabited or only sparsely populated and not suitable for building roads. Neuberger pointed out that if Alaska's area was reduced to 40 percent, it would cut the amount of federal monies received by \$42 million over a 10 year period. He suggested that the Senate accept the 40 percent figure, but Case held out for 33.3 percent, arguing that this would "not be a bad start, considering that at the present time Alaska is entirely on a hand-out basis." Neuberger replied that assuming the 40 percent figure was adopted, Alaska would receive \$13,390,000 in federal funds in fiscal year 1958. This sum would gradually increase to \$18.3 million in 1969, not a substantial federal contribution to an area as vast as Alaska "where road

building is very expensive, where there exist high mountain ranges, steep terrain, terrific ice conditions, and permafrost, which require expensive roadbed construction." Case acknowledged these facts, but pointed out that many "well-established" states would receive less money than Alaska under the proposed formula for primary, secondary, urban, and interstate highways. Alabama, for example, would get \$17.7 and Arizona \$10.6 million; Arkansas \$13 million; Colorado \$13 million and Connecticut \$8 million--and the list continued. Case thought that this would result in creating much hostility toward Alaska and lose the amendment. Case argued that "to get started in Alaska, it would be the better part of discretion to start on a more modest basis." Neuberger tried again to compromise on a 40 percent basis, but Case insisted on 33.3 percent. Neuberger thereupon modified his amendment to comply with the wishes of the South Dakotan, stating that it was "important and...essential for us to recognize that Alaska does merit inclusion." Senators Warren G. Magnuson (D., Washington) and Wayne Morse (D., Oregon) supported the amendment, while Senators Albert Gore (D., Tennessee) and Robert S. Kerr (D., Oklahoma) objected. Kerr suggested that Neuberger change his amendment so that Alaska's allocation of FAHA funds did not exceed that of any state of the Union. He proposed a figure of 100,000 square miles instead of Neuberger's 180,000 square miles for the area portion of the formula. Neuberger resisted, pointing out that under his formula Alaska would receive a federal allotment of \$11,456,000 in 1958, and this would increase to \$15,657,000 in 1969. Once Kerr realized how relatively small Alaska's allotment of FAHA funds was, he withdrew his objections. After additional debate, the Senators agreed to Neuberger's amendment.³⁰

Throughout the debate, Delegate Bartlett was present. In fact, he had come early in order "to buttonhole as many Senators as I can find and urge their support of the Neuberger amendment." The effort, led by the Senator from Oregon, had succeeded beyond wildest expectations. Bartlett had found it difficult to adequately express his gratitude to Senator Neuberger, for that "would have required a wonderful collection of dotting adjectives and general all-around purple prose." Bartlett had "entertained only slight hope that your [Neuberger's] efforts in Alaska's behalf in including us in the National Highway Bill would be successful. The odds were all against you. But even if you had gone down to defeat, your unstinting cooperation, your leadership, your devoted search for means whereby Alaska might come under the bill would have been forever appreciated by me." Bartlett still found "it difficult to believe that you put it over." In short, it had been "a wonderful victory." A couple of days later, on June 1, the Washington Evening Star reported that the Senate had sent to a conference committee the highway bill which included language "for ending a questionable discrimination against Alaska." The House had excluded the territory from this benefit as had "been the case since the first Federal aid highway bill was enacted in 1916." The paper urged the conferees to seriously consider the Neuberger amendment.³¹

Bartlett recognized the efforts of a group of Alaskan mayors who had visited Washington in the winter where they had "labored diligently and long to convince the top Commerce Department officials to endorse Alaska's inclusion. In this mission they failed." The majors had believed that the Department of the Interior would recommend Alaska's inclusion before the appropriate Congressional committees. Bartlett had shared this conviction. Instead Assistant Secretary of the Interior D'Ewart had merely urged the

addition "of meaningless language" suggesting that Alaska's highway construction program be accelerated. Unfortunately, Bartlett observed, Governor B. Frank Heintzleman had "been a reluctant dragon. For some reason or other he is frightened over the possibility that Congress might instead of giving us a special formula put us into partnership with the states and other territories thereby obliging us to take over the maintenance assignment as well as putting up about \$13.5 million of construction money." The delegate was convinced that this never would have happened. As he had predicted, the lawmakers had diminished "our land amounts for the purpose of proportionment so we would not receive so much construction money." Although a victory had been won, there still was the possibility that "the House conferees may refuse adamantly to accept Alaska or the amendment may be switched all around to the disadvantage of Alaska." He vowed to attempt to prevent this "in conferences with the individual conferees." And the delegate worked hard to accomplish just that, contacting the conferees and summarizing for them the arguments for including Alaska in the FAHA. He pointed out, however, that he would oppose any reduction below the 33.3 percent for determining apportionment. In fact, Bartlett stated that he felt "so very strongly about this that I would prefer not to have Alaska included at all..."³²

A few days later, A.F. Ghiglione, the Commissioner of Roads for Alaska and the head of the Alaska Road Commission, announced that his agency would oppose any amendment using less than 50 percent of Alaska's area for computing the territory's allotment of funds under the FAHA. He argued that using less than half of the area would result in fewer construction dollars. Ghiglione acknowledged that the Bureau of Public Roads would absorb the Alaska Road Commission if the territory was included. His

agency had supported such a change in the past, but he warned that Bureau of Public Roads construction standards were much higher than those of the Alaska Road Commission. This would result in "less construction of development and pioneer access roads...and the raising of standards on all Alaska road construction would tend to cut down the total mileage of new roads because of higher costs." Bartlett was not amused with Ghiglione's statement, acidly observing "that never before had I known of a bureau within a department seeking to establish policy...the department is supposed to decide on policy and the operating agency is supposed to effectuate that policy."³³

Ghiglione hastened to tell Bartlett that a reporter had misquoted him. He assured the delegate that he had already supported Alaska's inclusion in the FAHA, and had only been concerned about the reduction below 50 percent of the allowable area factor. Bartlett, however, distrusted Ghiglione who, he surmised, had realized that under the Bureau of Public Roads "he no longer would be king of everything he surveyed. He doesn't like the idea."³⁴

On June 21, 1956, Bartlett reported that the conferees had accepted the modified Neuberger amendment, including Alaska in the FAHA using 33.3 percent of the territory's area for computing allotments. The measure contained appropriation authorization for 3 years, 1957 to 1959. Alaska's estimated share of federal funds amounted to \$2,090,000 in 1957, with a 10 percent territorial match of \$190,000; \$14,520,000 and \$1,320,000 in 1958; and \$14,850,000 and \$1,350,000 in 1959. The Department of the Interior 1957 appropriation for Alaska road construction and maintenance amounted to \$11,425,000, the last such monies to come from that source. On June 26, the House and Senate accepted the conference report on the FAHA of 1956.

Some territorial citizens complained that Congress once again had discriminated against Alaska. Bartlett explained to those critics that discrimination worked in Alaska's favor at times. For example, "nowhere else under the Federal Aid Highway System, including Hawaii and Puerto Rico, is there permitted an intermingling of federal funds for construction and maintenance." The Neuberger amendment permitted Alaska to do this, and additionally, "we are required to match federal appropriations only on the order of 10 percent." On June 29, 1956, President Dwight D. Eisenhower signed the Federal Aid Highway measure into law. The Daily Alaska Empire carried a headline reading "New Road Building Era Dawns in Alaska," while the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner entitled its story "Steady Flow of Funds Seen Boon to Entire Territory."³⁵

Delegate Bartlett was ecstatic, remarking that he considered "this as one of the greatest legislative victories in Alaska's history." Thanks to the interest, devotion and unceasing efforts of Senator Neuberger we at long last have become a partner in the Federal Aid Highway System."³⁶ For the first time "we will be able to proceed on the basis of long-range planning." The transfer of the Alaska Road Commission to the Bureau of Public Roads in the Department of Commerce was to occur within 60 days. Precisely how the change was to occur nobody knew. Many of the employees of the Alaska Road Commission, however, were apprehensive about what the future was to bring. All those interested knew that in time the change would touch the jobs they performed. Some expected transfers within the Bureau of Public Road's world-wide functions. It was certain that the new law terminated the Alaska Road Commission, unique among federal agencies in Alaska because of its virtual total autonomy with all headquarters functions performed in Alaska. Most agreed that the Alaska Road Commission

had done a superior job in undertaking and supervising the bulk of Alaska's road, trail and bridge construction for the last 51 years.

FOOTNOTES

1. Ernest Gruening, The State of Alaska (New York: Random House, 1954, 1968), p. 443.
2. Ibid., p. 451.
3. Draft Bartlett Bill, H.R. 2353, February 23, 1945, amendment to Federal Highway Act, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 1, Federal Departments & Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska.
4. Notes accompanying Bartlett Bill, H.R. 2323 of February 23, 1945, Proposal for Extension of Federal Highway Act to Alaska, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 1, Federal Departments & Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska.
5. Ibid.
6. Krug to Joseph W. Martin, Speaker of the House, July 15, 1947, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 1, Federal Departments & Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska.
7. Press Release, Department of the Interior, "Krug Announces Expanded Road Program for Alaska," July 30, 1948, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 1, Federal Departments & Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska.
8. Ibid.

9. Claus-M. Naske, Paving Alaska's Trails: The Work of the Alaska Road Commission (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc., 1986), pp. 227, 229.
10. Irving Reed to E.L. Bartlett, April 1, 1955, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 4, Federal Departments & Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska.
11. Everett P. Wood to Bartlett, April 5, 1955, Bartlett to Croul, May 3, 1955, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 5, Federal Departments & Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska.
12. Cong. Record, 1 S., p. 5791 (May 23, 1955).
13. Ibid.
14. Reed to Bartlett, June 1, 1955, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 5, Federal Departments & Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska.
15. Address Given before the Alaska Chamber of Commerce Convention Sessions, Fairbanks, Alaska, November 3-5, 1955, Resolution V, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 5, Federal Departments & Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska.
16. Bartlett to Curtiss, November 9, 1955, Curtiss to Bartlett, November 17, 1955, Wood to Bartlett, December 12, 1955, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 5, Federal Departments & Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska.
17. Bartlett to Heintzleman, December 12, 1955, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 5, Federal Departments & Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska.

18. Heintzleman to Bartlett, December 17, 1955, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 5, Federal Departments & Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska; Anchorage Daily Times, December 16, 1955.
19. Wood to Senators Henry M. Jackson, Clinton P. Anderson, Albert Gore, Dennis Chavez, Warren G. Magnuson, Hugh Butler, Representatives Claire Engle, Leo W. O'Brien, Charles A. Buckley and Thomas M. Pelly, December 20, 1955, Wood to Walter Williams, Under Secretary of Commerce, December 21, 1955, Wood to Bartlett, December 21, 1955, Bartlett to Wood, December 27, 1955, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 5, Federal Departments & Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska.
20. Anchorage Daily Times, December 27, 1955, Anchorage Daily News, December 28, 1955, Brief, "Favoring Inclusion of Alaska Under the Federal Highway Act," n.d. (1956), E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 5, Federal Departments & Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska.
21. Bartlett to Magnuson, January 9, 1956, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 5, Federal Departments & Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska.
22. Bartlett to William K. Boardman, January 10, 1956, Wesley A. D'Ewart to Wood, January 16, 1956, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 5, Federal Departments & Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska.
23. H.R. 8836, 84 C., 2 S. (January 26, 1956).
24. Washington Daily News, January 28, 1956; Bartlett, "Memorandum on Alaska Roads," February 6, 1956, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 5, Federal

Departments & Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska.

25. Bartlett to F.O. Eastaugh, February 14, 1956, "Statement of Assistant Secretary of the Interior Wesley A. D'Ewart before the House Committee on Public Works" on Tuesday, February 21, 1956, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 5, Federal Departments & Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska.
26. "Proposed Amendment to H.R. 8836," February 27, 1956. Following are the approximate federal apportionment if Alaska was included in the FAHA. The amounts shown are for the fiscal years 1958-1969, inclusive, based on a federal aid apportionment formula allowing only 50 percent of Alaska's total area in the calculation, based on federal aid apportionment formulas but allowing only 50 percent of total area.

(Thousands of Dollars)

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Primary</u>	<u>Federal Funds</u>		<u>Total</u>	<u>10-percent</u>	<u>Total</u>
		<u>Secondary</u>	<u>Urban</u>		<u>matching</u>	
					<u>funds</u>	
1958	\$9,746	\$6,545	\$56	\$16,347	\$1,635	\$17,982
1959	10,071	6,763	58	16,892	1,689	18,581
1960	10,396	6,891	60	17,437	1,744	19,181
1961	10,721	7,199	62	17,982	1,798	19,780
1962	11,046	7,417	64	18,527	1,853	20,380
1963	11,370	7,636	66	19,072	1,907	20,979
1964	11,695	7,854	68	19,617	1,962	21,579
1965	12,020	8,072	69	20,161	2,016	22,177
1966	12,345	8,290	71	20,706	2,071	22,777
1967	12,670	8,508	73	21,251	2,125	23,376
1968	12,995	8,726	75	21,796	2,179	23,975
1969	<u>13,320</u>	<u>8,944</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>22,341</u>	<u>2,234</u>	<u>24,575</u>
Total	138,395	92,935	799	232,129	23,213	255,342

- Bartlett to Richard L. Neuberger, March 1, 1956, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 5, Federal Departments & Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska.
27. Bartlett to Neuberger, April 20, 1956, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 5, Federal Departments & Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska; Cong. Record, 84C., 2 S, pp. 6397-6399 (April 26, 1956); The Washington Post, May 1, 1956.
28. Washington Daily News, May 5, 1956; Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, S. Report 1965 together with Supplemental Views and Individual Views to accompany H.R. 10660, 84 C., 2 S. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1956), pp. 1-2, 22.
29. Cong. Record, 84 C., 2 S., p. 7480 (May 17, 1956).

SUMMARY

HIGHWAYS AND ALASKA

Alaska is not now included in the Federal-Aid Highway program. The existing mileage of roads in the Territory is 4,270 miles. The present highway needs is about \$200 million. Registration of automobiles and trucks increased from 59,000 in 1955 to 73,000 in 1956. Gasoline tax of 5¢ per gallon produces about \$2,250,000 revenue. Total highway expenditures in the Territory increased from \$3,372,000 in 1948 to \$30,515,000 in 1951, then decreased to \$15,756,000 in 1954. Under apportionment formula in existing law Alaska would receive \$27,851,000 Federal-aid highway funds, with 86% Federal and 14% Territorial matching. Under the Gore Bill the apportionments would be about \$37,000,000 annually, for the next 5 years, and under the House Bill would increase from \$29,000,000 in 1957 to \$41,000,000 in 1969. Under the Statehood Bill the Territory would receive a total of \$30,000,000 over the next 15 years for operation and maintenance, and \$47,000,000 over the next 5 years for construction.

CONCLUSION

It appears that the Territory of Alaska should be included within the framework of the existing Federal-aid Highway law, and should have a program of approximately \$20,000,000 annually for the next 20 years. Such a provision could be included as an amendment to a Federal-aid Highway bill, or by special Act of Congress.

Theo W. Sneed, Staff Member, Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, "Highways and Alaska," Memorandum for Senator Clements, 1956, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 5, Federal Departments & Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska.

30. Bartlett to Homer E. Capehart, May 28, 1956, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 5, Federal Departments & Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska; Cong. Record, 84 C., 2 S., pp. 8320-8324 (May 29, 1956).

The House bill is based on a 13-year period with \$750 million authorized for first year and increasing each year by \$25 million until 1969 the total is \$1,025,000,000. The money is to be divided as follows: 45 percent for primary roads, 30 percent for secondary roads and 25 percent for urban roads.

The Senate bill is for a five-year period and authorizes \$900 million each year. The money is to be divided as follows: 44.444 percent for primary, 33.333 for secondary and 22.222 for urban.

Following are figures using the House and Senate formulas for 1/3 of Alaska's area and 100,000 square miles of Alaska's area:

<u>HOUSE - 1/3</u> (Thousands of Dollars)						
<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Primary</u>	<u>Federal Funds</u>			<u>10-percent matching funds</u>	<u>Total</u>
		<u>Secondary</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Total</u>		
1958	\$6,820	\$4,580	\$56	\$11,456	\$1,146	\$12,602
1964	8,190	5,500	68	13,758	1,376	15,134
1969	9,320	6,260	77	15,657	1,566	17,223
* * * * *						
<u>HOUSE - 100,000 square miles</u>						
1958	3,644	2,486	56	6,186	619	6,805
1964	4,373	2,983	68	7,424	742	8,166
1969	4,980	3,397	77	8,454	845	9,299
* * * * *						

SENATE - 1/3

1958	8,001	6,070	60	14,131	1,413	15,544
1959	"	"	"	"	"	"
1960	"	"	"	"	"	"
1961	"	"	"	"	"	"

* * * * *

SENATE - 100,000 square miles

1958	4,319	3,314	60	7,693	769	8,462
1959	"	"	"	"	"	"
1960	"	"	"	"	"	"
1961	"	"	"	"	"	"

Approximate Apportionments to Alaska, were Alaska to share in
 Funds Authorized, or Intended to be Authorized
 by H. R. 10660 for the Fiscal Years 1958-69, inclusive
 Based on Federal-aid Apportionment Formulas but Allowing only 1/3 of Total Area

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	(Thousands of Dollars)				<u>10-percent matching funds</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>Primary</u>	<u>Federal Funds</u>		<u>Total</u>		
		<u>Secondary</u>	<u>Urban</u>			
1958	\$6,820	\$4,580	\$56	\$11,456	\$1,146	\$12,602
1959	7,050	4,730	58	11,838	1,184	13,022
1960	7,280	4,890	60	12,230	1,223	13,453
1961	7,500	5,040	62	12,602	1,260	13,862
1962	7,730	5,190	64	12,984	1,298	14,282
1963	7,960	5,350	66	13,376	1,338	14,714
1964	8,190	5,500	68	13,758	1,376	15,134
1965	8,410	5,650	69	14,129	1,413	15,542
1966	8,640	5,800	71	14,511	1,451	15,962
1967	8,870	5,960	73	14,903	1,490	16,393
1968	9,100	6,110	75	15,285	1,529	16,814
1969	<u>9,320</u>	<u>6,260</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>15,657</u>	<u>1,566</u>	<u>17,223</u>
Total	\$96,870	\$65,060	799	\$162,729	\$16,273	\$179,002

Source: E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 5, Federal Departments & Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska.

31. Bartlett to J.H. Goding, May 29, 1956, Bartlett to Neuberger, May 31, 1956, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 5, Federal Departments & Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska; Washington Evening Star, June 1, 1956.
32. The mayors were: Joe Goding, Bob Sharp, Ken Hinchley, George Shannon, Douglas Preston and Matt Slankard. E.L. Bartlett, "Memorandum on Alaska Road Situation," June 1, 1956, Bartlett to George A. Dondero, June 4, 1956, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 5, Federal Departments & Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska.
33. Anchorage Daily Times, June 5, 1956; Bartlett to M.W. Slankard, June 13, 1956, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 5, Federal Departments & Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska.
34. Ghiglione to Bartlett, June 18, 1956, Bartlett to Bill Egan, June 19, 1956, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 5, Federal Departments & Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska.
35. Conference Report on H.R. 10660, Cong. Record, 84 C., 2 S., pp. 9855-9857 (June 25, 1956); Bartlett Memorandum containing estimates, June 21, 1956, Bartlett to George C. Shannon, June 27, 1956, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 5, Federal Departments & Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska;

Daily Alaska Empire, June 28, 1956; Fairbanks Daily News-Miner, June 30, 1956.

36. Bartlett to John S. LeFevre, June 30, 1956, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 5, Federal Departments & Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska.

THE TRANSITION FROM THE ALASKA ROAD COMMISSION
TO THE BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

Alaskans wanted to be included in President Dwight D. Eisenhower's 1955 proposal for a 10 year road program for the United States. By the early summer of 1956, northern readers avidly followed Congressional debates on amendments to the Federal Aid Highway Act which would include the territory. F.E. Andrews, the division engineer of the Bureau of Public Roads in Portland, Oregon, summarized the Alaska situation for BPR Commissioner C.D. Curtiss. Local papers, chambers of commerce and the general public favored U.S. Senator Richard Neuberger's amendment including Alaska. The Alaska Road Commission publicly opposed the territory's participation because the area formula had been reduced from one-half to one-third. Alaska Road Commission officials had implied that the territory would get less money under the Neuberger amendment than it received through ARC appropriations; and that, if enacted, Congress no longer would allocate funds for Forest Highways. Andrews stated that he had discussed the situation at a Juneau Chamber of Commerce meeting. He was confident that the public now understood that there would be no change in the Forest Highway allocations, and that, in the long run, Alaska would gain by inclusion in the Federal Aid Highway Act. The ARC received approximately \$11.5 million annually, about the same Alaska would receive under the FAHA for the first two years, provided the Neuberger amendment was passed. Over the years, Alaska's share would increase to \$15.8 million by 1969. Under the House version, the territory would get somewhat more than \$14 million each year for the ten years. Andrews knew why the ARC objected to Alaska's inclusion in the FAHA. The Neuberger amendment provided for the transfer

of ARC funds, personnel, equipment and property to the Bureau of Public Roads, ending that organization's existence.¹

At the end of June Congress had passed the FAHA of 1956--and it included Alaska. J.W. McKinley, a Juneau resident keenly interested in the improvement of Alaska's transportation network, wondered what would happen now. He told Delegate Bartlett that he was "not too happy with the Bureau of Public Roads taking over the whole works" since the taxpayer never had controlled "the expenditures or programs of this Bureau." In fact, the BPR had always "done as they well pleased, the results of which was the continual rebuilding "of the Forest Highways." The Bureau had never lengthened the meager 126 miles in the Tongass National Forest in the Juneau area. "I do hope that we will not be faced with the same problems." McKinley asserted that the only way to overcome the Bureau's tight-fisted control was "to have some of those very fine men in the Alaska Road Commission transferred to executive jobs in the Bureau, and the planning and expenditure of the funds strictly controlled by the four members of the Territorial Board of Road Commissioners, and NOT by directives from the Bureau or any other agency, either Federal or Territorial, or we would not gain at all." McKinley also wanted to know if Congress would still appropriate money for the Forest Highway program.²

Bartlett noted that the legislation provided for the BPR to take over the ARC in not more than 90 days after approval of the Act, although he was uncertain about the timetable for the transfer. He was certain, however, that ARC personnel would not occupy the same positions in the Bureau. Bartlett agreed that the ARC had performed splendidly and "built roads cheaply and well--when it had the money." Unfortunately, too often it had been starved for appropriations, "and that is why it was necessary for us

to make the switch." He continued that Alaska would not possess the same autonomy as a state, and the "federal government through the Bureau of Public Roads will exercise a tighter control than it does in a State." The delegate speculated that the Bureau might well be particularly attentive to the Alaska situation, "and because the Bureau officials know that the Alaska Road Commission has been highly regarded, they may be more than ordinarily anxious to do a first-class job." In any event, he assured McKinley, Alaska would continue to receive special appropriations for its Forest Highways.³

A few days later, the secretary of the Department of Commerce and the commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads spelled out the significance of Section 107 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956. It provided for Alaska's participation in the apportionment of Federal Aid primary, secondary and urban funds. The Department of the Interior had to transfer its Alaska road functions to the Department of Commerce within 90 days. Alaska was included in the apportionment of the \$125 million authorized for fiscal year 1957, but its share for that year came to only \$1,932,588. In the next year, however, that was to rise to \$13.2 million. Before a Federal aid program could be developed in Alaska, the ARC had to be transferred to the Department of Commerce, no easy task. Many operating problems needed to be solved before the transfer became effective. The Secretaries of the Interior and Commerce discussed the transfer, but did not indicate where the ARC was to be located physically within Commerce. Apparently, both secretaries still contemplated that the ARC continue to exist.⁴

By mid-August of that year, the two secretaries had drafted a memorandum of agreement dealing with the transfer. It provided that all records, property, personnel, funds and activities of the ARC be transferred to

Commerce by September 16; all records pertaining to the ARC and located in the Office of Territories, Department of the Interior likewise were to be turned over to Commerce. Any claims pending before the Interior Board for Contract Appeals were to be determined by that board and be binding upon Commerce; and that any existing contract, lease, easement, license, permit, or agreement "heretofore entered into by or granted by or to the Department of the Interior by and through the Alaska Road Commission shall remain in full force and effect" and also be transferred to Commerce and "be binding upon that Department." Finally, "all actions pursuant to this agreement "were to be consonant with applicable procedures approved by other appropriate government agencies, including but not limited to, the General Services Administration, Civil Service Commission, General Accounting Office, and Bureau of the Budget."⁵

In the meantime, Delegate Bartlett urged Commissioner Curtiss to establish a separate Alaska region because the complexity and scope of territorial operation made it absolutely necessary to create a direct chain of command from Washington to the field. Indeed, Alaska operations had been handicapped during the last few years when the office there had been relegated to district status and was under the Portland office of the BPR. The delegate told the Commissioner that in his experience there always had been a smoother and more effective administration when the Alaska office of the many federal agencies operating in Alaska reported directly to Washington instead of having to go through a headquarters office on the West Coast. Curtiss was uncertain about the precise organizational structure of the BPR in Alaska but thought that a division with much delegated authority would be the most appropriate for handling the consolidated territorial work. The Commissioner, in turn, asked Bartlett's help in persuading the

territorial legislature to establish a highway department, which, in time, would take over the management of the Federal aid highway program in much the same manner as handled by the various territories and states.⁶

Obviously, such a major change for Alaska raised many questions among northern residents. For example, the Fairbanks Chamber of Commerce studied the legislation and concluded that "a great deal of good will result from the inclusion of Alaska" in the FAHA. Several important questions, however, needed to be answered. These included what policy the Bureau planned to establish in setting road construction and maintenance standards, and how would construction priorities be arrived at? How would funds be allocated between the four judicial divisions, and what were considered truck routes, feeder and urban roads? The chamber had gone to the core of the new legislation, because the Bureau already had arrived at a tentative interpretation of the new legislation. E.J. Martin, the chief of budget and management of the BPR "felt that the law was so written that on the face of it, Alaska would receive relatively small benefits from the Eisenhower highway program." He realized, however, that "the law permitted a possible interpretation by Alaska based upon her unique situation that would enable the Territory to receive greatly increased funds under this act." In essence, Alaska's definition of its road system seemed to be the key to the problem of receiving small or large amounts of federal funds. If the territory chose to include dogsled trails, which had been postal routes, in its transportation system then the total mileage would be greatly enlarged and funds comparably increased. If, however, it only included the existing road system used by the postal service and limited in mileage, then it would suffer in comparison to the individual states. It

may be recalled that the FAHA used the following factors in formulating allotments for primary, secondary and urban roads:

Primary - 1/3 according to area (one-third of Alaska's area under the special formula--195,467 square miles); 1/3 according to population (128,643 total population according to the 1950 census. In all cases the BPR used the last decennial census for all states and territories); 1/3 according to mileage of star and rural routes (not road mileage, 1,742 miles according to the U.S. Post Office Department).

Secondary - The same formula was used as for primary roads except that it only counted the rural population, which, according to the 1950 census, came to 94,381 souls.

Urban - The sole factor for allocating funds for urban roads was according to population in places of over 5,000 inhabitants. The figure used for Alaska's allotment was 28,286.⁷

The BPR was very inflexible on the formula, taking its population figures from the last decennial census, and the mileages from the U.S. Post Office Department. Alaska's chance for increased funds lay in making a persuasive case for its unique location and difficult geography. In fact, in the summer and early fall of 1956, the BPR was still uncertain about how specifically the FAHA applied to Alaska.

On September 16, 1956 the official transfer of all ARC employees to the BPR took place, and Commissioner Curtiss established a division office, headquartered in Juneau, to be referred to as Division 10. The division engineer assumed all the responsibilities exercised by his colleagues in division 7, 8, and 9, except that he was not to establish nor fill any positions not included in the list of employees transferred from the Alaska Road Commission, nor was he to change wage board rate schedules. Pending

further instructions, F.E. Andrews, the district engineer of the Division 8 office in Portland, Oregon became acting division engineer for division 10. A couple of weeks later, the Department of Interior transferred \$8,929,783.73 in obligations and an unobligated balance of \$5,010,424.68 to the BPR for a total of \$13,940,208.41.⁸

A few days later, the BPR had drawn up a list of considerations bearing upon the designation of the federal aid systems in Alaska. It had studied the language in Section 107(a) and found that the system in the territory was to "be determined and agreed upon by the Governor, the Territorial Highway Engineer, and the Secretary of Commerce without regard to the mileage limitations in the Federal Highway Act," a departure from its previous opinion that the mileage used by the U.S. Post Office Department in its star and rural routes determined allocation of funds. Instead, the extent of the mileage included in the federal aid systems was to be geared to the territorial capability of financing each system on a long-range basis. The most important highways qualified for federal aid primary designation and those of next importance for secondary designation. Portions of primary and secondary routes lying within urban areas of less than 5,000 population were eligible for improvement work financed by federal primary and secondary funds, respectively. In the four urban areas with a population in excess of 5,000, namely Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau and Ketchikan, urban extensions of the primary system were eligible for improvements funded by either federal primary or urban funds while urban extensions of the secondary system in these four towns were eligible for improvements with federal urban funds.⁹

The BPR found that of the \$850 million FAHA funds for fiscal year 1958, Alaska was to receive \$7,809,925 in primary, \$5,266,562 in secondary

and \$65,112 in urban funds for a total of \$13,141,599. The territory had to make a minimum contribution of 10 percent of the apportioned federal monies. Most importantly, Alaska could spend federal aid monies for maintenance, a privilege not granted any state or territory. Since operation and maintenance costs had amounted to about \$4 million per annum in recent years, this would leave more than \$10 million for construction each year. In addition, if a state highway department or its equivalent and the Commissioner of the BPR agreed that federal secondary funds were not needed, than these could be spent on the primary system.¹⁰

The BPR estimated that the 1,000 miles classed as through roads and some of the more important of the 1,250 miles of highways, called feeder roads, could be included in the primary system; the remainder of the feeder road mileage would probably receive a secondary designation. Additionally, some of the 1,300 miles embracing the local road system would also qualify for secondary designation, particularly the 600 miles which had received winter maintenance. Highways in isolated areas normally only qualified for secondary classification, but there was no legal prohibition to change that to primary designation. The main qualification should be the transportation importance of the route. The highways around Juneau furnished a good example. If they were all designated secondary, then their urban extensions would only qualify for the limited urban funds. On the other hand, roads planned to open new areas would normally receive secondary designation, but could be upgraded later on when the traffic justified it.¹¹

The BPR had provided a bare interpretation of the 1956 act. Innumerable questions remained as to what could and could not be done. Irving Reed, the Territorial Highway Engineer, had a list of questions for Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks. The Territorial Board of Road

Commissioners, he informed the Secretary, had recently held a three day meeting to ascertain Alaska's position under the FAHA. After intensive discussions, the board had instructed Reed to obtain answers to a long list of questions. Without the information, Reed would be unable to submit a budget to the forthcoming legislature nor make any recommendations for necessary changes in territorial laws which would make the transition to the FAHA easier. The board also wanted to know what role the office of the highway engineer was to play under the new structure.¹²

Secretary Weeks asked Commissioner Curtiss to reply to Reed's lengthy queries, but his staff advised him to simply send a letter of acknowledgment. Most of Reed's questions required considerable research and study. It also "would then give us jurisdiction in writing" to develop the Secretary's interpretations of how the FAHA of 1956 applied to Alaska.¹³

For example, Reed had asked if ferry tolls could be charged to federal aid routes, and the first impression was that this was not possible. Further studies, however, raised uncertainties, for Sect. 325 of 47 stat. 446, 48 U.S.C. placed the authority to charge tolls in the Secretary of the Interior. This authority now had been transferred to the Secretary of Commerce under Sect. 107(b) of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956. Broader interpretations needed to be made of the Bureau of Public Roads' role in Alaska in contrast to federal aid functions in the contiguous states. For example, Sect. 107(a) of the 1956 act stated that federal aid expenditures in Alaska were to be made "on the same terms and conditions" as in the several states. The same section, however, went on to modify the above language by providing maintenance expenditures on federal aid systems and 100 percent payment for both construction and maintenance.¹⁴

The 1956 act, in addition to normal federal aid functions, transferred other responsibilities to the Department of Commerce. The record of the Congressional debates on Alaska's inclusion revealed that federal aid was to be a substitute for previous special Interior appropriations to cover the Alaska functions transferred to the Department of Commerce. The territory had to contribute 10 percent of federal aid funds to the U.S. Treasury. Congressional legislation in the early 20th century had failed to give the district of Alaska complete authority to act as a state highway department. Instead, it had given these powers first to the War Department and then to the Department of the Interior. These powers had now been transferred to the Department of Commerce which, therefore, had a two-fold responsibility: to manage federal aid, and to administer additional highway functions normally vested in a state highway department.¹⁵

Slowly, the BPR researched and answered Reed's questions. Specifically, he had pointed out that federal laws required the reservation of rights-of-way across all private property in Alaska so that roads could be built "by or under the authority of the United States or any state created out of the Territory of Alaska." Did inclusion in the FAHA constitute enough "authority of the United States" for the territory to claim these rights-of-way? The answer--not the territory, but certainly for the BPR, the successor agency to the ARC. This also was true for rights-of-way across the public domain. Reed had asked who would hold title to roads constructed and maintained with federal aid funds, and roads built by the federal government and to be maintained with federal aid funds? The answer was that the title for the right-of-way for such roads belonged to the United States, but it also belonged to the territory or the appropriate

municipalities for roads constructed by them but maintained with federal aid monies.¹⁶

These were complex questions that needed to be answered, and in the process the BPR interpreted FAHA as it applied to Alaska. In October, the bureau sent a team to Alaska in order to observe the transition and make necessary changes in the process. Delegate Bartlett welcomed the group's travel north to familiarize itself with the Alaska situation. He was concerned, however, about a rumor that the BPR did not intend to offer positions to the numerous top personnel of the ARC. He hoped that it was only a rumor, but wanted to be advised immediately "if there is any truth to these rumors." They were groundless, because the BPR took over all 890 employees of the ARC.¹⁷

Since there were so many questions about the implementation of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 in Alaska, Secretary Weeks dispatched Edward Margolin, the special assistant to the undersecretary of Commerce for transportation to address the annual convention of the League of Alaskan Cities in Ketchikan on November 1. Margolin briefly explained that the 1956 act substantially embodied President Eisenhower's program for modernizing the national system of interstate and defense highways over a 13 to 15 year period. Eisenhower had first proposed this program in his message to the Governor's Conference in 1954, in which he envisaged a 41,000-mile network connecting 48 states and linking 209 cities. The far-reaching provisions of the act, however, went far beyond the interstate system program by preparing for the greatest roadbuilding and highway program in American history. Its economic, and he might have added social effects, would be tremendous and long-lasting. Apart from the interstate system, the act provided increased funds for all federal aid primary,

secondary and urban systems, and importantly, had brought Alaska "within the Federal-aid highway family."¹⁸

Because of the increased responsibilities the territory was to assume, the Commissioner of the BPR had reestablished the Division Office 10, headquartered in Juneau. Margolin also introduced Morton Flint as the new Division Engineer, replacing F.E. Andrews who had temporarily filled the position. He reminded his audience that the BPR and many of its engineers were no strangers to Alaska. For example, the BPR had built the 1,430 mile Alaska Highway for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Since 1921 the Bureau had built and maintained the National forest highways, both in Alaska and the contiguous states. In 1949 and 1950, when Congress appropriated the first large sums for upgrading Alaska's transportation system to make it usable for military purposes, the Bureau had assisted the ARC until the latter could organize to take care of the expanded program.¹⁹

Now the Bureau was in the process of integrating its Juneau district office, which had administered the Forest highway program, with the newly created Division 10 office. When completed, it combined the entire federal roadbuilding program in Alaska. In addition, the former ARC organization and its employees were integrated into the Division 10 office. The Bureau was convinced "that the joint experience, and abilities of both groups now can be teamed together for the best interests of Alaska and our Nation."²⁰

In October, a group of high-level Bureau representatives had toured Alaska and inspected most of the territory's transportation network. It also had conferred with Alaska's governor, the Territorial Road Commission and Highway Engineer regarding the selection of highways and roads for the federal aid system. The group had also begun work on various administrative problems, such as starting operations under federal aid guidelines,

and to coordinate the accounting and budget systems of the ARC and the BPR. Margolin predicted that not only would Alaska enjoy a long-range highway program with more stabilized financing, but the territory also would have a greater voice in determining its road systems and how to use the increased allocations of federal funds.²¹

Margolin told his audience what the territory would receive for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1957, 1958, and 1959. In 1956, federal grants for territorial highways totaled \$11,760,000. The ARC had received \$9,800,000 and Forest highways \$1,960,000. For 1957, the total of \$15,317,000 included \$11,425,000 previously authorized for the ARC, \$1,960,000 for Forest highways, and \$1,932,000 in federal aid. The 1958 total climbed to \$15,757,000, with Forest highways accounting for \$2,615,000 and \$13,142,000 in federal aid. The 1959 total of \$16,143,000 included \$2,615,000 for Forest highways and \$13,528,000 in federal aid. The 1956 act required Alaska to contribute 10 percent in matching funds each year, far less than the 50 percent generally required of the contiguous states. And although nobody could say with certainty what the future would bring, Margolin expected federal aid for Alaska to continue at least equal to the 1959 authorizations.²²

It was too early to spell out exactly what the Bureau was going to do in Alaska since it had just started its work on a grand scale. Margolin reminded his listeners that the 1956 act had extended FAHA to Alaska, but with important differences. Unlike in the contiguous states, federal aid funds could be used for the maintenance of roads within the eligible systems; only one-third of Alaska's area was to be used in calculating the apportionment of funds; and the Bureau not only represented federal

interests in the north but also would serve as the equivalent of a state highway department.²³

The Bureau, in planning Alaska's primary and secondary improvements, as well as urban upgrading and interconnections, intended to consider both present traffic needs and potential developments. Margolin advised his audience that Alaska's road programs "should be of such extent that they can be built within a reasonable period of time and maintained with the funds in prospect." He acknowledged that Alaska had peculiar problems, such as permafrost, and in some locations 80 feet of snowfall annually and winds which at times reach 100 miles per hour. Maintenance would be a challenge, and the Bureau had always stressed its importance. Indeed, no jurisdiction should build roads to such low standards that maintenance costs became a constant burden, "not to mention the poor service which results."²⁴ This remark, no doubt, alluded to the different standards held by the ARC and the Bureau. The former built pioneer roads of low design standards which opened desirable areas for economic activities. When money became available, it upgraded these roads. The latter had built roads to high standards. Very expensive, its mileage in the National forests had been very limited. Alaskans, eager for pioneer roads, had criticized Bureau practices for years.²⁵

Margolin stated that Alaskans had gained substantially by inclusion in the 1956 FAHA. It provided stable funding for road construction and permitted long-range planning. Alaskan cities, in particular, had the opportunity of profiting from "the mistakes of so many urban centers in the 48 States. By and large, these cities never even had a chance to plan streets and highways which could handle today's traffic streams. Their patterns of land use and transportation were set before motor vehicles came

on the scene." In Alaska, however, it was different. Northerners, with the aid of federal aid funds, could "draw up master plans which will link land usage, highway planning, and resource development in a pattern designed for modern transportation needs." Alaskan city planners and highway engineers could "adopt modern, tested, details of highway design and standards which will provide safe, efficient traffic movement for today's and tomorrow's vehicles at the lowest maintenance and investment cost." Many problems would arise, and neither the Bureau nor the Department of Commerce pretended to have all the answers or solutions. He promised full cooperation, and concluded that "the motive power, the vision, energy, and effort, will come from your greatest resource--the people of Alaska."²⁶

Those attending the annual convention of the League of Alaskan Cities liked the speech, and were particularly flattered by Margolin's closing remarks. In the meantime, however, Territorial Highway Engineer Irving Reed was frustrated. As will be recalled, he had posed a series of questions to the BPR involving the implementation of the 1956 act. He considered the answers he had received to be inadequate. On October 22 a conference took place in Alaska Governor Frank B. Heintzleman's office, attended by District Engineer Morton M. Flint, A.F. Ghiglione, William Niemi and Chr. Wyller, all from the Region 10 office in Juneau, and Frank Turner and James Allen from the Washington, D.C. headquarters of the BPR, as well as Reed. The meeting, according to the latter, accomplished nothing. No decisions were made, and no answers given to the series of questions he had posed in September and reiterated at the conference. On October 25, another meeting took place in the same office between the governor, Flint and Reed. Again, it "was also a very unsatisfactory meeting" because Flint had made no

decision on classifying Alaskan roads into primary, secondary, and urban categories. Reed was baffled why it should "take so long or be so mysteriously hard" to classify the territorial roads. He reminded Flint that "the old Alaska Road Commission had data covering the condition, length and status of every road" it had constructed. Reed had copies in his office, and he personally had inspected almost every road in Alaska, even "most of the short farm and access roads" and believed himself "qualified to judge the condition of the greater part of them." He believed that the classification problem could be solved with a little cooperation on the part of the Bureau.²⁷

On November 6, 1956 Flint died and Ghiglione replaced him in an acting capacity. As an old Alaska hand and the former director of the ARC, he knew that the various construction projects had to proceed. By the middle of November, the BPR had extended an invitation to contractors to bid on four bridges on the Glenn Highway, namely Moose (Mile 54.9), Eska (Mile 61), Granite (Mile 62.55), and Purinton (Mile 89.3) Creek bridges. In December, the Bureau awarded the contracts. The bid price, plus engineering and government-furnished materials, totaled \$320,000. The budgetary item for these bridges had a balance of \$337,600, enough to cover the contract but sufficiently close to consider transferring funds from other items within this appropriation.²⁸

Ghiglione informed Assistant BPR Commissioner Frank Turner that the Interior appropriation "Construction of Roads, Alaska" included several budgetary items such as Preparation of Plans, Reconstruction of Existing Roads, Surfacing of the Alaska Highway, Glenn Highway, Sterling Highway, and others. Transfer of funds between these items required Secretarial approval, and was often done so as to use remaining monies from completed

projects and permit realistic programming in the field. As of December, an unobligated balance of \$1,290,693 remained in the Interior appropriation. Additionally, "we are reserving \$453,394 for possible obligation of claim settlements now pending before the Interior Board for Contract Appeals of the Department of Commerce." Ghiglione advised Turner to think about the utilization of Interior funds within budgetary items since the need for transfers of funds between items would arise continually. He suggested that under BPR rules Secretarial clearance for each transfer might no longer be necessary and therefore making the process a simple one. Interior budget procedures required it in order to satisfy the Congressional Appropriation Committees and the Bureau of the Budget which had scrutinized ARC programs in detail. Neither Congress nor the Bureau of the Budget required this detailed program review under federal aid procedures. Ghiglione proposed, therefore, that the BPR consolidate all remaining Interior funds for use on current construction work regardless of budgetary item identification. No 1958 Interior budget would be prepared for the ARC, but Ghiglione assumed that federal aid funds would be used to complete projects previously authorized by Congress.²⁹

By the end of 1956 the transition from the ARC to the BPR had been accomplished. Many policy, procedural, and structural questions, however, remained and awaited solutions in the months ahead.

FOOTNOTES

1. F.E. Andrews to C.D. Curtiss, June 15, 1956, 62-A-1283, box 65, R.G. 30, Washington Federal Records Center, Suitland, Maryland.

2. J.W. McKinley to E.L. Bartlett, June 27, 1956, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 5, Federal Departments and Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska.
3. E.L. Bartlett to J.W. McKinley, July 2, 1956, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 5, Federal Departments and Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska.
4. Memorandum, J.C. Allen to Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce, and C.D. Curtiss, Commissioner of Public Roads, July 6, 1956, J.C. Allen to C.D. Curtiss, July 18, 1956, 62-A-1283, box 65, R.G. 30, Washington Federal Records Center, Suitland, Maryland.
5. "Memorandum of Agreement between Department of Commerce and Department of the Interior with Respect to Transfer of the Alaska Road Commission from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Commerce," August 14, 1956, 62-A-1283, box 65, R.G. 30, Washington Federal Records Center, Suitland, Maryland. Sec. 107 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 pertaining to Alaska follows:

SEC. 107. HIGHWAYS FOR ALASKA

23 USC 48 and
note; 16 USC
503.

(a) APPORTIONMENT; MATCHING; SELECTION OF SYSTEMS.--The Territory of Alaska shall be entitled to share in funds herein or hereafter authorized for expenditure for projects on the Federal-aid primary and secondary highway systems, and extensions thereof within urban area, under the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and the Acts amendatory therereof or supplementary thereto, upon the same terms and conditions as the several States and Hawaii and Puerto Rico, and the Territory of Alaska shall be included in the calculations to determine the basis of apportionment of such funds, except that one-third only of the area of Alaska shall be used in the calculations to determine the area factor in the apportionment of such funds: Provided, That the Territory of Alaska shall contribute funds each fiscal year in an amount that shall be not less than 10 per centum of the Federal funds apportioned to it for such fiscal year, such contribution to be deposited in a special account in the Federal Treasury for use in conjunction with the Federal funds

23 USC 6.

apportioned to the Territory. The system or systems of roads on which Federal-aid apportionments to the Territory of Alaska are to be expended shall be determined and agreed upon by the Governor of Alaska, the Territorial Highway Engineer of Alaska, and the Secretary of Commerce, without regard to the limitations contained in section 6 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 212), as amended and supplemented. The Federal funds apportioned to the Territory of Alaska and the funds contributed by such Territory in accordance herewith may be expended by the Secretary of Commerce either directly or in cooperation with the Territorial Board of Road Commissioners of Alaska, and may be so expended separately or in combination and without regard to the matching provisions of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 212); and both such funds may be expended for the maintenance of roads within the system or systems of roads agreed upon under the same terms and conditions as far the construction of such roads.

5 USC 485.

(b) TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS.--Effective not more than ninety days after the approval of this act, the functions, duties, and authority pertaining to the construction, repair, and maintenance of roads, tramways, ferries, bridges, trails, and other works in Alaska, conferred upon the Department of the Interior and heretofore administered by the Secretary of the Interior under the Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 446; 48 U.S.C., sec. 321a and following), are hereby transferred to the Department of commerce, or under his direction, by such officer, and officers, as may be designated by him.

(c) TRANSFER OF PERSONNEL, ETC.--There are hereby transferred to the Department of Commerce, to be employed and expended in connection with the functions, duties, and authority transferred to said Department by subsection (b) hereof, all personnel employed in connection with any such functions, duties, or authority, and the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds now available, or that hereafter may be made available, for use in connection with such functions, duties, or authority; and the Department of the Interior is directed to turn over to the Secretary of Commerce all equipment, materials, supplies, papers, maps, and documents, or other property (real or personal, and including office equipment and records) used or held in connection with such functions, duties, and authority.

(d) EFFECTUATION OF TRANSFER.--The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce shall take such steps as may be necessary or appropriate to effect the transfer from the Department of the

Interior to the Department of Commerce of the functions, duties, and authority, and the funds and property, as herein provided for.

(e) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNCTION.--The Secretary of Commerce shall have power, by order or regulations, to distribute the functions, duties, and authority hereby transferred, and appropriations pertaining thereto, as he may deem proper to accomplish the economical and effective organization and administration thereof.

P.L. 627, All 70 Stat. 374.

6. E.L. Bartlett to C.D. Curtiss, July 26, 1956, C.D. Curtiss to E.L. Bartlett, August 15, 1956, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 5, Federal Departments and Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska.
7. S.G. Nerland to C.D. Curtiss, August 15, 1956, Donald J. Belcher to E.L. Bartlett, August 13, 1956, Allocation table, August 14, 1956, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 5, Federal Departments and Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska. List of Alaska's principal highways together with a descriptive text showing the status of improvements of each as of September, 1956:

Route No. 1, Richardson Highway - Valdez to Fairbanks

The entire route has been reconstructed and is now paved from Valdez, Mile 0 to Mile 36, from Mile 70 to Mile 128 and from Mile 227 to Fairbanks, Mile 365. The sections between Mile 36 and 70, and Miles 128 and 227 are under contract for paving. It is not believed that the paving will be completed before the end of the 1957 season.

Route No. 2, Alaska Highway - Canadian Border to Big Delta

It is expected that the reconstruction of the section between the Canadian Border, Mile 1221 and Northway at Mile 1265 will be completed this fall, including base courses of crushed gravel. The section from Northway, Mile 1265 to Mile 1296 has been regraded and widened prior to paving. We have no information on the paving of this section which was originally planned for 1957 with completion scheduled for the fall of 1958. The section from Mile 1296 to Big Delta Junction, Mile 1429 (Richardson Highway, Mile 268) is paved except for a short line change between Halfway House, Mile 1391, and Johnson River, Mile 1385. This line change and portions of the section from Tok, Mile 1318 to Johnson

River, Mile 1385 under contract for repaving are scheduled for completion by fall of 1956.

Route No. 3, Glenn Highway - Anchorage to Tok Junction

The paving of the section between Gulkana Junction and the Chistochina River was completed in the fall of 1955 and the entire highway is now paved and in good condition.

Taylor Highway

The Taylor Highway, extending from Tetlin Junction, Mile 1306 on the Alaska Highway to Eagle, and by side road to Dawson, is completed and open to traffic during the summer months. Some stage construction work involving widening and grading in perma frost areas continues on this gravel-surfaced road.

Route No. 4, Seward-Anchorage Highway

Paved from Seward to Anchorage - no major improvements contemplated.

Route No. 5, Sterling Highway

This route, from Soldotna to Homer, is a gravel-surfaced road in fair condition. The reconstruction and paving of the Kenai spur and a portion of the main highway from Soldotna eastward some ten miles will probably be completed this fall. The section between this project and the Forest Boundary, Mile 58, is under contract for reconstruction and a major portion of this section will be relocated to avoid long and steep grades on the present highway. The portion from Mile 39 to Mile 58 (Forest Highway Route 5) is under contract for paving and will probably be completed in August 1957.

Route No. 6, Steese Highway - Fairbanks to Circle and Circle Hot Springs

The first two miles out of Fairbanks have been paved and the next three miles are under contract for grading. The remainder of the route is low standard gravel-surfaced road in fair condition.

Route No. 7, Elliott Highway

This gravel-surfaced road extends from Fox, Mile 10 on the Steese Highway, to Livengood. No major improvements are contemplated. However, the Territory is initiating construction of an extension of this road to the mining communities of Eureka and Manley Hot Springs west of Fairbanks.

Route No. 8, Denali Highway

This route includes the McKinley Park roads as well as the new access road being built from Paxson, Mile 186 on the Richardson Highway, to Mt. McKinley Park. Construction, which has been performed

by Force Account, is complete from Paxson west for 40 miles to the MacLaren River, and from the Susitna River, 56 miles east of Cantwell, to Cantwell and to McKinley Park, connecting there with the Park Highway extending west to Kantishna. The reconstructed section of his highway between the Susitna and MacLaren Rivers is under contract for grading and the Alaska Road Commission expects that the road will be open for traffic by June 1, 1957.

Route No. 9, Haines Highway

The Haines Highway from Haines to the Alaska-Canada Border at Mile 40 is paved. The Canadian section from Mile 40 to the Alaska Highway Junction at Mile 160 (Alaska Highway Milepost 1016) is a gravel-surfaced road kept open to travel only during the summer months. No major improvements are contemplated.

Copper River Highway

The route has been constructed between Cordova and Alaganik Slough at Mile 22 and this portion is on the Forest Highway System and maintained by the Bureau of Public Roads. The roadbed is the old Copper River Railroad which has been converted to highway. The road is narrow with no surfacing of any kind except pitrun gravel.

The project covering the section between Mile 22 and Mile 39 and crossing the Copper River delta is under progress but will probably not be completed this fall as anticipated. It is most likely that it will be well into 1957 season before the project is completed.

The Alaska Road Commission has under progress, a location survey from Mile 39 towards Katalla.

The section between Mile 39 and Mile 51, "The Million Dollar Bridge", has been surveyed and Alaska Road Commission has, at the present time, a crew surveying north from Mile 51. Some surveying has also been done from Chitina south.

The present route between Chitina and Willow Creek is an old, very low-standard road with grades up to 15-18 percent and about a 12-foot width with no surfacing of any kind. The bridges are in particularly bad condition and are all posted for a 5-ton load limit and a 5-mile per hour speed limit. The present road is of no particular value in connection with the proposed through highway between Cordova and Willow Creek except as an access road.

Source: 62-A-1283, box 66, folder Central Correspondence Files, Alaska Forest Highways, 1955-56, R.G. 30, Washington Federal Records Center, Suitland, Maryland.

8. Memorandum from C.D. Curtiss, "Establishment of Alaska Division Office," September 16, 1956, Circular Memorandum from C.D. Curtiss,

"Acting Division Engineer, Division 10," September 16, 1956, C.H. Smith to U.S. Treasury Department, October 4, 1958, 62-A-1283, box 65, R.G. 30, Washington Federal Records Center, Suitland, Maryland. A list of the transferred employees follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE - BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS
September 16, 1956

MASS TRANSFER OF EMPLOYEES FROM ALASKA ROAD COMMISSION
TO THE BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

Pursuant to Section 107 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 (Public Law 627, 84th Congress, 2nd Session) the following employees and their positions are transferred from the Department of the Interior, Alaska Road Commission, to the Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads, effective September 16, 1956. This does not change the type of appointment, position, grade, or salary of the employees involved.

JUNEAU HEADQUARTERS - CLASSIFIED

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Series-Grade</u>
1.	Adams, William B.	6-3-96	Realty Officer (Supv.)	GS-1172-12
2.	Bales, Magnus W.	1-21-03	Administrative Officer	GS-301-14
3.	Barber, William L.	12-16-33	Engr. Aid (Civil)	GS-802-1
4.	Baxter, Francis E.	7-17-12	Supv. Hwy. Des. Engr.	GS-822-12
5.	Beck, Frederick W., Jr.	5-18-29	Bridge Engineer	GS-824-7
6.	Bell, Joseph, Jr.	12-25-27	Highway Des. Engr.	GS-822-9
7.	Berger, Henry W.	10-17-16	Supv. Engr. Aid (Civil)	GS-802-7
8.	Bolton, Donald F.	4-30-21	Supv. Bridge Des. Engr.	GS-824-13
9.	Booth, Norma C.	7-20-20	Clerk-Stenographer	GS-312-4
10.	Bracken, Harry C.	1-19-89	Mail Clerk	GS-305-3
11.	Bruesch, Lawrence D.	3-6-25	Highway Engineer	GS-820-5
12.	Campbell, Bruce A.	1-23-31	Bridge Engineer	GS-824-9
13.	Casperson, Bruce R.	8-12-35	Engr. Aid (Civil)	GS-802-2
14.	Chatfield, Benjamin V.	11-2-29	Hwy. Constr. Engr.	GS-823-9
15.	Cole, Allene E.	8-12-19	Appointment Clerk	GS-211-5
16.	Cusack, Vernon V.	1-3-25	Bridge Engineer	GS-824-9
17.	Daniels, Hannah	6-1-07	Prop. & Stock Control Clk.	GS-2040-6
18.	Davis, Marian	3-23-10	Accountant (Cost)	GS-510-5
19.	Detter, Christine E.	8-31-35	Voucher Examiner	GS-540-4
20.	DeLaHunt, Roland J.	1-14-95	Supv. Hwy. Constr. Engr.	GS-820-14
21.	Devinney, Dorothy F.	8-26-15	Clerk-Typist	GS-322-3
22.	Devon, James L.	9-28-23	Voucher Examiner	GS-540-5
23.	Dick, Viola H.	10-6-10	Clerk-Stenographer	GS-312-4
24.	Filler, George	4-12-21	Bridge Engineer	GS-824-7
25.	Flygare, Clark L.	5-4-34	Engr. Aid (Civil)	GS-802-4

JUNEAU HEADQUARTERS - CLASSIFIED (continued)

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Series-Grade</u>
26. Ford, Marjorie K.	4-30-21	General Supply Clerk	GS-2001-4
27. Freeman, Kathryn H.	1-14-20	Mail & File Supervisor	GS-305-7
28. Freeman, Thomas W., Jr.	12-21-23	Engr. Aid (Civil)	GS-802-3
29. Fuerstenau, Loyd E.	12-22-14	Personnel Officer	GS-201-11
30. Gerhard, Lauraine C.	9-29-09	Secretary (Stenography)	GS-318-5
31. Ghiglione, Angelo F.	5-29-09	Director	GS-301-15
32. Haag, E. Robert	2-28-17	Property & Supply Officer	GS-2001-11
33. Harman, David J.	5-30-35	Engr. Aid (Civil)	GS-802-5
34. Hendrickson, Lance E.	1-3-03	Auditor	GS-510-12
35. Hixson, Buel M., Jr.	2-5-28	Highway Engineer	GS-820-9
36. Honeywell, Alene K.	10-12-37	Clerk-Stenographer	GS-312-3
37. Johnson, Andrew E.	5-28-24	Engr. Aid (Civil)	GS-802-3
38. Johnston, Edna L.	3-7-03	Voucher Examining Supv.	GS-540-7
39. Jones, Clinton G.	12-8-22	Bridge Engineer	GS-824-11
40. Jorgensen, Harold V.	4-23-93	Supv. Hwy. Des. Engr.	GS-822-11
41. Kennedy, Emery F.	5-9-09	Safety Engineer	GS-803-9
42. Klockenteger, William S.	10-14-01	Materials Engineer	GS-806-12
43. Lantz, L. Jonathan	1-11-25	Engineering Draftsman	GS-818-2
44. Lister, Mildred	8-22-06	Time, Leave & Payroll Supv.	GS-544-5
45. Long, Donald H.	8-1-33	Highway Engineer	IGS-820-5
46. Lorain, Maude R.	11-14-03	Secretary (Stenography)	GS-318-6
47. Lowell, John A.	5-29-26	Bridge Engineer	GS-824-9
48. Lundwall, Sidney L.	9-30-10	Hwy. Cost Research Engr.	GS-821-12
49. Lynch, Bonnie Jo	4-27-36	Clerk-Typist	GS-312-3
50. MacLean, Andrew K.	8-17-05	Constr. Engr. (General)	GS-811-12
51. Marshall, Adam J.	2-13-96	Hwy. Constr. Engr.	GS-823-12
52. Melin, Lenore N.	9-26-14	Supv. Cost Accountant	GS-510-9
53. Nelson, Harold L.	4-14-29	Bridge Engineer	GS-824-7
54. Niemi, William J.	3-15-04	Highway Engineer	GS-820-15
55. Nordling, Elizabeth	11-21-94	Personnel Assistant	GS-201-9
56. Nottingham, Elizabeth M.	11-15-19	Clerk (Stenography)	GS-301-5
57. Peck, Cyrus E., Jr.	5-8-34	Time, Leave & Payroll Clk.	GS-544-4
58. Pelley, Loyal W.	5-30-16	Supv. Accountant (Fiscal)	GS-501-9
59. Perry, John K.	2-9-23	Bridge Engineer	GS-824-9
60. Prow, Donald H.	5-30-24	Engr. Draftsman (Civil)	GS-818-6
61. Richards, Ruth A.	1-31-18	Mail & File Clerk	GS-305-3
62. Robbins, Terrence L.	9-6-17	Highway Constr. Engr.	GS-823-9
63. Robbins, Vera N.	2-15-20	Clerk-Stenographer	GS-312-4
64. Sanders, Walter L.	9-28-26	Hwy. Des. Engr. (Technician)	GS-822-9
65. Scott, John T.	1-20-17	Supply Officer	GS-2001-9

JUNEAU HEADQUARTERS - CLASSIFIED (continued)

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Series-Grade</u>
66.	Sensenbrenner, Keith E.	11-10-29	Highway Design Engineer	GS-822-7
67.	Shanley, Thomas H., Jr.	12-17-28	Highway Design Engineer	GS-822-7
68.	Shelhamer, Ellis E.	9-28-13	Supervisory Accountant	GS-510-11
69.	Shepard, John G.	4-11-94	Contracts Officer	GS-1102-12
70.	Sihler, Oscar R.	12-21-96	Supv. Hwy. Des. Engr.	GS-822-9
71.	Simmons, Elsie B.	4-29-07	Accountant	GS-501-7
72.	Soboleski, Joseph N.	2-17-30	Highway Engineer	GS-820-5
73.	Stewart, Benjamin D., Jr.	4-28-11	Supv. Hwy. Constr. & Maint. Engr.	GS-823-14
74.	Stewart, Ronald L.	9-1-95	Auditor	GS-510-9
75.	Sturm, Madeline H.	5-24-10	Accountant	GS-501-7
76.	Sweeney, Edward C.	12-18-97	Voucher Examiner	GS-540-5
77.	Sweet, Bonnie J.	10-16-37	Clerk-Typist	GS-322-3
78.	Thomasson, Janie V.	5-30-21	Time, Leave & Payroll Clk.	GS-544-4
79.	Tilton, Winfield S., Jr.	3-28-29	Bridge Engineer	GS-824-9
80.	Tracy, Richard G.	8-8-06	Budget & Finance Officer	GS-501-13
81.	Watts, Fred J.	9-6-31	Bridge Engineer	GS-824-9
82.	White, Joann D.	11-20-34	Clerk-Typist	GS-322-3
83.	Wilson, Albert W.	9-17-35	Engr. Aid (Civil)	GS-802-3
84.	Yates, Howard R.	12-1-19	Bridge Engineer	GS-824-9
85.	Young, Emily M.	5-2-09	Mail and File Supervisor	GS-305-5
86.	Young, William E.	2-12-20	Storekeeping Clerk	GS-2033-4

JUNEAU HEADQUARTERS - UNCLASSIFIED

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Grade</u>
87.	Burke, Norman A.	5-17-35	Civil Engineering Aid	5
88.	Dobbins, Charles G.	12-19-37	Civil Engineering Aid	1
89.	Kandle, Charles K.	8-9-34	Civil Engineering Aid	5
90.	Mohr, Robert G.	6-17-37	Civil Engineering Aid (Trainee)	3
91.	Nick, Ralph F.	4-19-14	Civil Engineering Aid	5
92.	Ramsey, Richard T.	3-2-35	Civil Engineering Aid (Trainee)	2
93.	Rhode, Charles J.	5-6-36	Civil Engineering Aid (Trainee)	4
94.	Rose, Raymond E.	12-27-30	Civil Engineering Aid (Trainee)	4
95.	Secrist, Robert H., Jr.	2-26-35	Civil Engineering Aid	3
96.	Sievenpiper, Harley H.	9-7-1900	Civil Engineering Aid	3
97.	Thomas, James O.	10-29-38	Civil Engineering Aid (Trainee)	2
98.	VanderWeyst, Ted	9-26-37	Civil Engineering Aid (Trainee)	3

ANCHORAGE DISTRICT - CLASSIFIED

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Series-Grade</u>
99. Alderson, Mercedes	9-24-27	Engr. Draftsman (Civil)	GS-818-4
100. Alexander, John A.	2-9-33	Highway Engineer	GS-820-5
101. Amer, Ahmad	10-22-22	Constr. Inspector (Gen.)	IGS-1871-9
102. Bear, David L.	4-7-16	Highway Design Engineer	GS-822-9
103. Branch, Kendall G.	10-11-32	Engineering Aid (Civil)	GS-802-5
104. Brown, Aino E.	10-19-24	Secretary (Stenography)	GS-318-5
105. Combs, Ethel B.	6-16-09	Clerk (General)	GS-301-5
106. Ellis, James F., Jr.	3-2-07	Highway Constr. Engr.	GS-823-11
107. Gibson, Edwin H.	8-7-17	Highway Engineer	GS-820-7
108. Gilley, Elizabeth M.	9-24-20	Accounting & Fiscal Clk.	GS-501-6
109. Hatchett, Lawrence A.	10-5-17	Highway Engineer	GS-820-12
110. Heath, George M.	2-22-32	Highway Engineer	GS-820-7
111. Hern, Laurette L.	5-30-16	Time, Leave & Payroll Clk.	GS-544-4
112. Hosel, Lois R.	7-19-08	Time, Leave & Payroll Clk.	GS-544-4
113. Johnson, Robert C.	1-10-22	Supv. Engr. Aid (Civil)	GS-802-8
114. Kaldor, Tracy D.	8-7-14	Contracts Assistant	GS-1102-9
115. Kamkoff, Alex	1-1-09	Highway Engineer	GS-820-9
116. Keenan, Josephine C.	1-6-11	Time, Leave & Payroll Clk.	GS-544-4
117. Lantz, G. Harlan	7-29-27	Highway Engr. (Technician)	GS-820-7
118. McLane, Stanley S.	6-25-24	Supv. Engr. Aid (Civil)	GS-802-7
119. McQueary, Frank A.	1-24-05	Highway Constr. Engr.	GS-823-11
120. Manning, Florence T.	9-11-17	Prop. & Stock Control Clk.	GS-2040-4
121. Marsch, Burton R.	7-2-24	Prop. & Stock Control Asst.	GS-2040-7
122. Metcalf, Charles H.	7-17-18	Supv. Eng. Aid (Civil)	GS-802-7
123. Myhre, Shirley A.	11-22-18	Prop. & Stock Control Clk.	GS-2040-5
124. Navjord, Gunnar	6-30-05	Highway Engineer	IGS-820-7
125. O'Marr, John S.	12-18-25	Administrative Assistant	GS-301-9
126. Radasch, Paul E., Sr.	6-20-04	Construction Inspector	GS-1871-8
127. Reed, Daniel L.	1-21-30	Supv. Engr. Aid (Civil)	GS-802-7
128. Runstetler, Alvin W.	9-20-19	Engineering Aid (Civil)	GS-802-4
129. Sasseen, Loren N.	7-13-35	Engineering Aid (Civil)	GS-802-3
130. Schedler, Kenneth R.	2-20-24	Highway Constr. Engr.	GS-823-11
131. Smith, Norman E.	12-8-19	Highway Constr. Engr.	GS-823-12
132. Taylor, Lewis D.	7-25-19	Administrative Officer	GS-301-11
133. Truselo, Walter	8-17-24	Highway Engr. (Technician)	GS-820-7
134. VanZanten, John J.	7-31-15	Highway Constr. Engr.	GS-823-11
135. Vroman, Robert H.	5-17-28	Supv. Engr. Aid (Civil)	GS-802-7
136. Watson, John R., Jr.	8-26-22	Materials Engineer	GS-806-11
137. Wennerstrom, Justin A.	7-18-30	Supv. Engr. Aid (Civil)	GS-802-7
138. Wheatley, Harold M.	3-26-19	Property & Supply Supv.	GS-204-8

ANCHORAGE DISTRICT - CLASSIFIED (continued)

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Series-Grade</u>
139. Whittington, Billy D.	1-12-25	Constr. Inspector (Gen.)	GS-1871-9
140. Williams, Wister E.	10-28-25	Highway Engr. (Technician)	GS-820-7
141. Zimmerman, Milton C.	3-5-06	Highway Engineer	GS-820-14

ANCHORAGE DISTRICT - UNCLASSIFIED

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Grade</u>
142. Bell, Leonard W.	5-7-32	Civil Engineering Aid	5
143. Brumbelow, Neil H.	2-18-34	Civil Engineering Aid	2
144. Brusiel, Robert F.	3-31-23	Civil Engineering Aid	5
145. Ciechanski, Edward L.	4-15-15	Civil Engineering Aid	3
146. Floyd, Lauren F.	3-2-09	Civil Engineering Aid	1
147. Fox, William B.	3-24-33	Civil Engineering Aid	1
148. Gorlac, Steven	1-9-15	Civil Engineering Aid	4
149. Griner, Lloyd	11-9-22	Civil Engineering Aid	6
150. Helgens, Richard	11-28-18	Civil Engineering Aid	2
151. Huling, Howard W.	12-7-03	Civil Engineering Aid	2
152. Huling, Paul E.	9-10-36	Civil Engineering Aid	2
153. Kircher, Ralph O.	5-28-36	Civil Engineering Aid (Trainee)	4
154. Kranich, Robert W.	11-14-36	Civil Engineering Aid	3
155. Krull, Robert G.	1-26-35	Civil Engineering Aid	5
156. McKenzie, David E.	6-23-37	Civil Engineering Aid	2
157. Moening, Harold J.	3-16-34	Civil Engineering Aid	4
158. Naske, Claus M.	12-18-35	Civil Engineering Aid	2
159. Pate, John A.	6-19-11	Civil Engineering Aid	7
160. Rice, Lane G.	6-19-37	Civil Engineering Aid (Trainee)	2
161. Sargent, Robert E.	8-28-35	Civil Engineering Aid	6
162. Smith, Fred J.	1-24-05	Civil Engineering Aid	7
163. Steinbach, Theodore G.	8-1-32	Civil Engineering Aid	5
164. Wassmann, Wendell J.	1-20-37	Civil Engineering Aid (Trainee)	3
165. Woodsum, Samuel D.	9-19-97	Civil Engineering Aid	7

ANCHORAGE DISTRICT - WAGEBOARD

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Grade</u>
166. Agick, Gust N.	11-14-14	Laborer	
167. Anderson, Ralph M.	3-17-96	Forman	Grade 2
168. Allen, Lloyd L.	10-12-09	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
169. Anderson, Archie C.	3-5-21	Truch Driver	Grade 2
170. Anderson, Emil	6-12-30	Tractor Operator	Grade 1

ANCHORAGE DISTRICT - WAGEBOARD (continued)

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Grade</u>
171. Atwater, Harding D.	7-10-20	Truck Driver	Grade 1
172. Bagley, N. Russell	9-8-06	Partsman	
173. Bagoy, Peter J.	1-21-08	General Forman	
174. Barge, Edward J.	6-12-14	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
175. Bell, Denny N.	12-4-21	Truck Driver	Grade 2
176. Bernsteen, James E.	8-24-05	Grader Operator	Grade 2
177. Betts, Thurman G.	4-14-15	Grader Operator	Grade 2
178. Boman, Waldo L.	9-4-10	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
179. Brandon, Melvin E.	6-10-19	Shovel Operator	Grade 2
180. Brannon, Paul G.	3-21-30	Truck Driver	Grade 1
181. Brown, Neil, A., Jr.	9-27-16	Forman, Mechanic	
182. Bumgarner, Robert L.	7-16-31	Laborer	
183. Bush, John D.	10-14-18	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
184. Byrd, John C.	8-1-98	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
185. Bystry, Peter	7-11-23	Forman	Grade 2
186. Carlson, Erick J.	3-15-35	Shovel Operator	Grade 1
187. Carlson, Melvin C.	10-1-06	Foreman	Grade 3
188. Carney, Edward E.	12-14-31	Oiler	
189. Carpenter, Leonard C.	2-14-13	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
190. Catledge, Leonard L.	4-7-09	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
191. Conner, Perry F.	11-13-08	Partsman Supervisor	
192. Cottini, Victor S.	1-14-05	Truck Driver	Grade 1
193. Cummins, Larry	7-9-91	Truck Driver	Grade 1
194. Daggett, George F.	1-26-25	Partsman	
195. Dahl, Kenneth C.	11-25-31	Truck Driver	Grade 1
196. Darnell, Ivan	7-21-10	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
197. Davis, Charles J.	8-17-96	Foreman	Grade 2
198. Davison, Stanley A.	11-15-35	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
199. Denison, George A.	10-16-23	Timekeeper	
200. Doner, Dale D.	8-6-13	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
201. Drashner, Everett C.	6-27-20	Warehouseman	
202. Dubendorf, Jacob A.	3-20-05	Mechanic Supervisor	
203. Dugan, Raymond J.	6-4-23	Electrician	
204. Edmond, Carl A.	10-4-87	Watchman	
205. Engwall, William T.	6-16-19	Truck Driver	Grade 2
206. Erickson, George S.	12-1-16	Foreman	Grade 3
207. Erickson, Walter	9-9-92	Truck Driver	Grade 1
208. Falquist, Roy J.	9-8-05	Foreman	Grade 2
209. Fanning, Carl V.	9-15-35	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
210. Foote, Alvin J.	8-15-26	Warehouseman	

ANCHORAGE DISTRICT - WAGEBOARD (continued)

Name	Date of Birth	Title	Grade
211. France, Miles G.	12-4-21	Shovel Operator	Grade 2
212. France, Vernon H.	10-25-20	Grader Operator	Grade 2
213. Franklin, Donald	4-20-06	Foreman	Grade 2
214. Frenz, Harold J.	8-15-22	Timekeeper	
215. Frisbie, Arthur C.	1-7-08	Watchman	
216. Gardner, Lemoyne I.	6-24-10	Grader Operator	Grade 2
217. Garoutte, James L.	12-18-19	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
218. Gehrman, Emil H.	11-29-05	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
219. Gershmel, Robert W.	9-20-37	Truck Driver	Grade 1
220. Gordon, Harris L.	3-24-06	Truck Driver	Grade 2
221. Green, Fred E.	2-4-03	Sign Painter	
222. Greer, Mervin S.	8-2-16	Carpenter	
223. Hamann, Dennis L.	5-9-38	Oiler	
224. Harrison, James H.	6-25-93	Oiler	
225. Hautaniemi, Emil M.	2-2-97	Cook	
226. Heckel, Charles H.	12-30-02	Truck Driver	Grade 2
227. Heilman, Vernon F.	12-10-08	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
228. Herman, Clarence E.	10-3-17	Grader Operator	Grade 2
229. Herman, Jack	10-6-10	Tractor Operator	Grade 1
230. Hermon, James S.	10-1-28	Foreman	Grade 2
231. Hinman, James L.	1-22-14	Truck Driver	Grade 2
232. Hollier, Edward E.	7-5-17	Foreman	Grade 3
233. Holt, Noel T.	11-28-08	Grader Operator	Grade 2
234. Hooper, Franklin R.	6-25-27	Foreman	Grade 2
235. Horsefield, Leonard	2-27-02	Truck Driver	Grade 2
236. Hoseth, Mike	10-6-25	Truck Driver	Grade 1
237. Hosler, Elmer D.	10-12-07	Foreman	Grade 3
238. Hughes, Harry L.	7-18-15	Grader Operator	Grade 2
239. Hunt, Clarence J.	7-16-88	Watchman	
240. Hurd, Fred M.	4-19-96	Truck Driver	Grade 2
241. Huston, Aaron H.	1-9-17	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
242. Huston, Irvin J.	11-7-14	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
243. Hylan, John N.	10-9-04	Foreman	Grade 3
244. Ingalls, Donald	4-18-04	Grader Operator	Grade 2
245. Janecek, Frank J.	9-4-16	Partsman	
246. Jaynes, George L.	8-4-26	Grader Operator	Grade 2
247. Jensen, August R.	1-21-95	Laborer	
248. Johanson, Deloss H.	10-3-16	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
249. Johnson, Richard N.	11-18-35	Laborer	
250. Jones, Paul E.	4-16-30	Truck Driver	Grade 2

ANCHORAGE DISTRICT - WAGEBOARD (continued)

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Grade</u>
251. Keith, Russell M.	11-27-1900	Grader Operator	Grade 2
252. Kepler, David C.	11-1-25	Timekeeper	
253. Kerestine, Peter P.	7-5-20	Truck Driver	Grade 2
254. Kie, Steve	12-24-28	Plumber - Steamfitter	
255. Kingsley, Clovis H.	11-5-24	Grader Operator	Grade 2
256. Knowles, David L.	1-23-18	Grader Operator	Grade 2
257. Koivu, Reino	5-4-15	Tractor Operator	Grade 1
258. Kranich, Robert W.	4-27-04	Foreman	Grade 2
259. Lajoi, Gerard	4-8-25	Fireman	Grade 2
260. Larson, Adolph J.	3-27-36	Truck Driver	Grade 1
261. Lenferink, John F.	11-9-98	Watchman	
262. Lesky, Ronald W.	5-29-34	Laborer	
263. Lewis, Arthur L.	4-10-02	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
264. Lewis, Charles O.	1-15-06	Foreman	Grade 1
265. Lippitt, Charles W.	1-29-22	Grader Operator	Grade 2
266. Luckhurst, Erland W.	11-25-30	Truck Driver	Grade 1
267. Lunardelli, Fred	12-13-13	Carpenter	
268. Lynch, James F.	9-19-11	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
269. Lynch, Raymond L.	4-16-15	Machinist	
270. Lynch, Richard E.	8-28-09	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
271. McDade, Vaughn B.	11-17-98	Painter	
272. McDowell, Clifford	3-19-03	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
273. McKechnie, Raymond E.	6-23-13	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
274. McLean, Irene M.	12-30-97	Laborer	
275. McNally, William F.	12-20-34	Laborer	
276. McSorley, Frederick J.	1-12-29	Truck Driver	Grade 2
277. Markvardsen, Peter K.	1-12-27	Truck Driver	Grade 2
278. Marsh, Clarence E., Sr.	10-27-03	Foreman	Grade 2
279. Melgenak, Teddy	8-15-37	Laborer	
280. Mommsen, Richard J.	3-15-27	Painter	
281. Monsen, Nicholas J.	3-22-28	Tractor Operator	Grade 1
282. Moore, Walter P.	10-24-17	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
283. Mullen, Francis E.	10-3-21	Watchman	
284. Mulvaney, James P.	8-21-95	Truck Driver	Grade 2
285. Murto, Arne W.	6-4-18	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
286. Nicely, St. Clair M.	9-29-1900	Laborer	
287. Nicklie, Johnson	10-16-14	Laborer	
288. Nicklie, Lingo	11-27-30	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
289. Nicklie, Oley	10-13-98	Mechanic Helper, Heavy Duty	
290. Nicklie, Tracy	6-28-36	Truck Driver	Grade 2

ANCHORAGE DISTRICT - WAGEBOARD (continued)

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Grade</u>
291. Nielsen, George A.	12-26-98	Carpenter	
292. Niemann, Gernard N.	1-6-17	Grader Operator	Grade 2
293. Olson, Manvil H.	1-19-08	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
294. Onkka, Oliver	6-14-13	Foreman	Grade 3
295. O'Rourke, Thomas J.	8-28-17	Oiler	
296. Ostness, Oliver	2-12-23	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
297. Oswald, Phillip Jr.	3-27-15	Mechanic, Automotive	
298. Patterson, Earl G.	6-4-26	Truck Driver	Grade 2
299. Payne, William G.	5-9-1900	Cook's Helper	
300. Pennanen, Martin	5-14-1900	Laborer	
301. Peterson, Erik O.	1-23-94	Laborer	
302. Peterson, Oliver B.	2-28-05	District Mechanic	
303. Peterson, Otto W.	7-22-28	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
304. Pfaff, Ernest F.	5-23-06	Carpenter	
305. Porter, Clifford C.	11-14-26	Mechanic Helper, Heavy Duty	
306. Porter, Melvin J.	4-9-29	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
307. Powers, Bobbie W.	1-14-29	Watchman	
308. Powers, George R.	3-26-34	Truck Driver	Grade 2
309. Rasmussen, Elmer G.	1-29-17	Foreman	Grade 3
310. Rehder, Edward Jr.	9-23-15	Grader Operator	Grade 2
311. Rennie, David P.	5-30-94	Truck Driver	Grade 1
312. Robinson, Harry E.	7-30-29	Truck Driver	Grade 2
313. Robinson, John M.	3-3-26	Foreman, Mechanic	
314. Rogers, Lawrence	1-22-25	Truck Driver	Grade 2
315. Roque, Conrado J.	12-24-99	Laborer	
316. Rorrison, Lawrence D.	4-10-22	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
317. Rorrison, Lawrence P.	9-16-94	Truck Driver	Grade 2
318. Rowe, Harold B.	9-15-07	Carpenter	
319. Sanders, Claude E.	5-24-17	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
320. Sandstrom, Raymond A.	2029-08	Grader Operator	Grade 2
321. Savo, John H.	7-12-33	Laborer	
322. Scheid, Clarence O.	11-15-15	Foreman	Grade 3
323. Schupp, Emory A.	12-6-97	Cook	Grade 3
324. Scroggs, Donald R.	6-20-36	Mechanic, Automotive	
325. Scroggs, Lonnie W.	8-7-27	Oiler	
326. Seitz, Robert L.	9-5-14	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
327. Self, Robert J.	11-13-11	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
328. Sell, Otto	3-5-97	Carpenter	
329. Shantz, Donald F.	8-2-27	Tractor Operator	Grade 1
330. Shelley, Homer A.	12-15-06	Foreman	Grade 2

ANCHORAGE DISTRICT - WAGEBOARD (continued)

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Grade</u>
331. Sholin, Carl A.	4-15-03	Foreman	Grade 3
332. Sholin, Dale A.	6-11-33	Grader Operator	Grade 2
333. Simpson, George D.	3-12-97	Fireman	Grade 2
334. Simpson, James	5-19-06	Cook	Grade 2
335. Skipper, John D.	9-11-20	Mechanic Supervisor	
336. Skipper, Juanita S.	11-25-17	Timekeeper	
337. Small, Frank A.	4-22-24	Truck Driver	Grade 2
338. Smith, Albert M.	5-16-14	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
339. Smith, Robert I.	1-31-28	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
340. Soberg, Ralph	9-10-07	General Foreman	
341. Soper, Louis E.	1-5-30	Mechanic Helper, Heavy Duty	
342. Steinberger, Raymond J.	7-6-03	Grader Operator	Grade 2
343. Still, Raymond E.	1-1-25	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
344. Stock, William T.	6-13-10	Foreman, Mechanic	
345. Stockhausen, John J.	6-7-17	Foreman	Grade 3
346. Stoskopf, William F.	11-26-23	Pumping Plant Operator	
347. Stover, Harold W.	3-9-26	Grader Operator	Grade 2
348. Stover, Paul H.	2-19-22	Foreman	Grade 2
349. Swanson, Anton B.	4-2-09	Foreman	Grade 3
350. Tachick, Paul	6-13-09	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
351. Tansy, Alfred	5-1-36	Truck Driver	Grade 2
352. Tansy, Roy J.	3-16-34	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
353. Tatje, Frederick W.	6-16-10	Carpenter	
354. Tennyson, William M.	2-14-27	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
355. Thurmond, Clinton	6-24-24	Shovel Operator	Grade 2
356. Triber, Forrest E.	5-29-14	Foreman	Grade 2
357. Tryck, William O.	4-9-14	Mechanic Helper, Heavy Duty	
358. Turkington, Robert B.	5-21-23	Truck Driver	Grade 2
359. Tyone, Duffey	11-18-36	Truck Driver	Grade 2
360. Tyone, Fred	10-18-31	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
361. Vanborg, Gilbert G.	11-18-27	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
362. VanKeuren, Chester G.	11-28-05	Mechanic, Automotive	
363. Varin, George N.	2-13-31	Truck Driver	Grade 2
364. Wasbrekoff, Dick	10-11-11	Laborer	
365. Weatherell, George H.	3-2-04	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
366. Wells, Wilford N.	4-8-96	Shovel Operator	Grade 2
367. Widdifield, Lawrence R.	12-15-16	Foreman	Grade 1
368. Williams, Carl G.	11-3-12	Foreman	Grade 2
369. Williams, Wilbur A.	12-19-20	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
370. Wilson, Allen E.	3-8-22	Mechanic, Automotive	

ANCHORAGE DISTRICT - WAGEBOARD (continued)

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Grade</u>
371. Yarbrough, Robert B.	3-18-28	Laborer	
372. Active, James T.	7-15-22	Truck Driver	Grade 1
373. Elliott, Donald E.	11-24-34	Truck Driver	Grade 1
374. Tikiun, Thaddeus J.	12-13-24	Truck Driver	Grade 1
375. Williams, Charlie G.	11-3-37	Truck Driver	Grade 2
376. Silver, Jack	3-27-97	Fireman	Grade 2
377. Keyes, Marsden E.	4-10-99	Carpenter	
378. Jones, Richard J.	4-7-29	Truck Driver	Grade 1
379. Nielsen, Charles A.	5-9-29	Truck Driver	Grade 1

FAIRBANKS DISTRICT - CLASSIFIED

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Series-Grade</u>
380. Bigam, Winnie L.	4-12-16	Time, Leave & Payroll Clk.	GS-544-4
381. Borup, Arline O.	12-1-16	Prop. & Stock Control Clk.	GS-2040-4
382. Brown, Allyn H.	9-30-20	Highway Design Engineer	GS-822-9
383. Cameron, William P.	9-11-12	Highway Engineer	GS-820-12
384. Cripe, Cecil L.	6-22-98	Highway Engineer	GS-820-7
385. Douglas, Helen W.	1-7-01	Prop. & Stock Control Clk.	GS-2040-4
386. Dunham, Harvey W.	5-3-94	Highway Engineer	GS-820-12
387. Durnell, Donald A.	1-25-09	Highway Constr. Engr.	GS-823-11
388. Feagins, Clairmont D.	4-24-19	Supv. Engineering Aid (Civil)	GS-802-7
389. Findley, Hilda C.	7-5-22	Clerk (Gen.) Prop. & Supply	GS-2040-5
390. Gunderson, Hubert B.	6-24-16	Administrative Officer	GS-301-11
391. Hutchison, Elizabeth M.	2-26-24	Accounting & Fiscal Clerk	GS-501-4
392. Isackson, Frances L.	2-12-15	Administrative Assistant	GS-301-8
393. Johansen, Hendryx W.	11-24-13	Highway Engineer	GS-820-14
394. Laws, Helen C.	9-28-22	Clerk-Stenographer	GS-312-4
395. Long, Gordon H.	4-1-25	Highway Engineer	GS-820-7
396. Long, Jessie M.	9-17-23	Prop. & Stock Control Clk.	GS-2040-4
397. MacClanahan, George R, Jr.	7-29-25	Supv. Hwy. Constr. Engr.	GS-823-9
398. MacDonald, Donald, III	9-2-09	Highway Constr. Engr.	GS-823-9
399. McLemore, Esther C.	4-8-25	Time, Leave & Payroll Clk.	GS-544-4
400. Nave, Arleigh W.	5-3-08	Engineering Aid (Civil)	GS-802-5
401. Purse, Donald A.	7-24-24	Supv. Engr. Aid (Civil)	GS-802-7
402. Quest, Harry E.	2-7-10	Prop. & Supply Supv.	GS-2040-8
403. Raymond, Arthur E.	1-12-16	Construction Inspector (Gen)	GS-1871-7
404. Rogers, Vernon J.	2-12-18	Highway Engineer	GS-820-7
405. Route, James R.	7-14-34	Engineering Aid (Civil)	GS-802-4
406. Rumage, F. Patricia	10-7-29	Clerk (Gen.) (Stenography)	GS-301-5
407. Smith, Florene E.	4-30-19	Accounting & Fiscal Clerk	GS-501-5
408. Soboleff, Simon M.	1-28-95	Highway Engineer	GS-820-7
409. Stewart, Ivan D.	11-3-27	Supv. Engr. Aid (Civil)	GS-802-7

FAIRBANKS DISTRICT - CLASSIFIED (continued)

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Series-Grade</u>
410. Thomas, Charlie H.	6-8-05	Highway Constr. Engr.	GS-823-9
411. Vinals, Albert L.	1-5-02	Materials Engineer	GS-806-11
412. Wagner, Paul M.	7-15-14	Hwy. Constr. Engr.(Technician)	GS-823-11
413. Welty, Stephen L.	5-30-21	Supv. Engr. Aid (Civil)	GS-802-7
414. Wilson, T. Hugh	12-9-97	Highway Design Engineer	GS-822-11

FAIRBANKS DISTRICT - UNCLASSIFIED

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Grade</u>
415. Antaki, John L.	12-5-18	Civil Engineering Aid	3
416. Acquino, Vincent G.	10-14-35	Civil Engineering Aid	5
417. Bowman, David M.	9-4-36	Civil Engineering Aid (Trainee)	2
418. Bridenbaugh, Calvin L.	7-24-30	Civil Engineering Aid	5
419. Brown, Dale J.	10-31-23	Civil Engineering Aid	5
420. Colson, Franklin A.	3-18-31	Civil Engineering Aid	5
421. Demit, Fred	9-1-23	Civil Engineering Aid	2
422. Dickmann, David B.	7-12-35	Civil Engineering Aid	6
423. Ebel, Herbert F.	5-15-16	Civil Engineering Aid	7
424. Jones, Rolland A.	7-10-28	Civil Engineering Aid	7
425. Knight, George R.	1-30-32	Civil Engineering Aid	7
426. Leslie, Kenneth A.	5-6-36	Civil Engineering Aid (Trainee)	3
427. Nelson, Clifford D.	2-17-35	Civil Engineering Aid	3
428. Reinicke, Robert H.	4-27-35	Civil Engineering Aid	5
429. Scrivner, Robert W.	9-11-35	Civil Engineering Aid	4
430. Seipel, Donald L.	10-20-36	Civil Engineering Aid (Trainee)	2
431. Sihler, Fred W.	3-3-36	Civil Engineering Aid	3
432. Underdahl, Roy A.	8-6-25	Civil Engineering Aid	3
433. Wilson, Melvin E.	8-3-35	Civil Engineering Aid	5

FAIRBANKS DISTRICT - WAGEBOARD

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Grade</u>
434. Ahrens, William A.	7-28-87	Powderman	
435. Alford, Warner H.	12-26-02	Truck Driver	Grade 1
436. Anderson, Earl W.	11-27-28	Oiler	
437. Anderson, Lawrence D.	2-5-27	Mechanic, Automotive	
438. Andrews, Gilbert J.	7-20-22	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
439. Atkins, Edgar E.	12-1-16	Oiler	
440. Baldwin, John F.	6-14-11	Foreman	Grade 2
441. Barthel, Richard C.	10-25-94	Truck Driver	Grade 2
442. Battersby, James E.	11-2-96	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
443. Bauer, Richard A.	10-29-88	Laborer	

FAIRBANKS DISTRICT - WAGEBOARD (continued)

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Grade</u>
444. Bell, John B.	11-27-94	Fireman	Grade 2
445. Benham, Loren W.	3-28-34	Truck Driver	Grade 2
446. Berg, Melvin	12-18-13	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
447. Bergsson, Anders	10-25-05	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
448. Bertinoia, Louis E.	1-29-30	Truck Driver	Grade 2
449. Beyer, Lloyd S.	9-8-33	Truck Driver	Grade 2
450. Brady, Don	3-28-29	Shovel Operator	Grade 2
451. Brean, Leonard C.	7-17-32	Mechanic Helper	
452. Been, Amos F.	7-17-03	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
453. Briggs, Lester L.	2-6-21	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
454. Brocies, Virginia	4-7-14	Timekeeper	
455. Bronniche, Fred	10-16-06	Foreman	Grade 2
456. Bronson, Harry E.	11-21-05	Foreman	Grade 2
457. Burnett, Dewey M.	9-19-98	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
458. Byrum, Donald F.	12-2-25	Truck Driver	Grade 2
459. Buck, Stanley R.	5-22-1900	Foreman	Grade 2
460. Calvin, Utah C.	4-4-16	Truck Driver	Grade 2
461. Carter, Archie L.	10-26-03	Oiler	
462. Celich, Eli	7-19-90	Powderman	
463. Chalcroft, Charles P.	1-8-20	Grader Operator	Grade 2
464. Champoux, Roy	4-16-06	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
465. Charles, Carl A.	7-17-30	Tractor Operator	Grade 1
466. Chessik, Norbert D.	5-28-35	Truck Driver	Grade 1
467. Choate, James H.	12-19-04	Truck Driver	Grade 2
468. Daniels, Dick	4-29-21	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
469. Davis, Edward R.	6-11-12	Timekeeper	
470. Demit, Jimmie	2-4-30	Truck Driver	Grade 1
471. Demoski, Claude	7-13-14	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
472. Denny, Archie	11-22-30	Truck Driver	Grade 2
473. Dennocenzo, James	11-11-10	Foreman	Grade 3
474. Dibble, Kenneth E.	4-26-06	Shovel Operator	Grade 2
475. Dolney, Edward J.	4-22-26	Grader Operator	Grade 2
476. Donnelly, Joseph T.	5-20-07	Foreman	Grade 2
477. Douglas, Constantine D.	5-23-95	Grader Operator	Grade 2
478. Drakula, Vasel	7-15-86	Powderman	
479. Duke, Clarence R., Jr.	11-15-37	Truck Driver	Grade 1
480. Dunlay, Robert J.	7-2-95	Grader Operator	Grade 2
481. Eagan, Daniel F.	7-2-19	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
482. Eidem, Jerald D.	12-16-34	Truck Driver	Grade 2
483. Erickson, John	11-26-92	Fireman	Grade 2

FAIRBANKS DISTRICT - WAGEBOARD (continued)

Name	Date of Birth	Title	Grade
484. Esary, Ronald L.	5-12-35	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
485. Espland, Sam A.	5-12-06	Carpenter	
486. Estabrooks, Clifford E.	8-1-32	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
487. Evans, Jonah E.	5-7-05	Grader Operator	Grade 2
488. Ferry, Charles O.	1-15-95	Laborer	
489. Ferry, Edward E.	12-24-26	Grader Operator	Grade 2
490. Fosmark, Alfred	10-26-94	Mechanic, Automotive	
491. Fredrickson, Ivan P.	10-10-20	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
492. Freeman, Joe	3-29-26	Grader Operator	Grade 2
493. Fritsch, Wyman	11-20-08	Foreman	Grade 3
494. Galbreath, Don	2-1-20	Partsman	
495. Gibson, James A.	9-15-20	Mechanic Supervisor	
496. Gould, John G.	1-12-94	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
497. Grantham, Norman D.	6-5-24	Foreman	Grade 2
498. Gregory, David J.	7-18-08	Mechanic, Automotive	
499. Hagen, Amund L.	5-24-90	Carpenter	
500. Halter, Douglas V.	11-6-24	Truck Driver	Grade 2
501. Hanson, Alfred J.	5-4-21	Truck Driver	Grade 2
502. Hapeman, Fred J.	3-29-26	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
503. Harbison, Charles G.	4-28-24	Grader Operator	Grade 2
504. Harbison, Seward B.	7-29-15	Shovel Operator	Grade 2
505. Hardenbrook, Denis N.	6-28-34	Truck Driver	Grade 2
506. Harrelson, Marvin E.	8-3-25	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
507. Hartiman, Bill G.	7-23-32	Truck Driver	Grade 2
508. Hartman, Arthur T.	5-8-07	Grader Operator	Grade 2
509. Haugen, Ardmore K.	12-5-34	Truck Driver	Grade 2
510. Hazen, Buckley C.	3-14-17	Foreman	Grade 2
511. Hennes, Larry P.	11-9-10	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
512. Hess, Don J.	1-1-28	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
513. Hill, Norman S.	9-18-20	Partsman Supervisor	
514. Hodges, Frank M.	9-4-99	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
515. Honer, Frank A.	8-10-27	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
516. Horton, Marion E.	2-23-13	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
517. Hughes, Edgar H.	3-20-19	Truck Driver	Grade 2
518. Hughes, Ray V.	7-11-12	Truck Driver	Grade 2
519. Hunt, Lewis E.	7-2-12	Grader Operator	Grade 2
520. Hutchinson, Robert	12-1-20	Truck Driver	Grade 1
521. Hutchison, Harold B.	4-19-26	Foreman	Grade 3
522. Isaac, Edward D.	8-25-37	Laborer	
523. Isaacson, Forrest D.	1-15-12	Foreman	Grade 2

FAIRBANKS DISTRICT - WAGEBOARD (continued)

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Grade</u>
524. Iverson, Alvin O.	4-15-12	Grader Operator	Grade 2
525. Ives, Lloyd W.	1-8-08	Mechanic Supervisor	
526. James, Walter H.	7-16-38	Laborer	
527. Jarvi, Matt	11-24-84	Fireman	Grade 2
528. Jenkins, William E.	10-26-08	Tractor Operator	Grade 1
529. Johnson, David L.	11-7-30	Truck Driver	Grade 2
530. Johnson, Frank J.	9-27-01	Foreman	Grade 3
531. Johnson, Harold E.	7-30-35	Truck Driver	Grade 2
532. Johnson, Lee A.	9-5-33	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
533. Johnson, Richard H.	5-18-34	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
534. Johnson, Rodger N.	1-11-25	Carpenter	
535. Johnson, Vernon L.	3-1-25	Foreman	Grade 3
536. Johnston, Fred B.	8-8-92	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
537. Johnston, Walter D.	4-26-29	Toolroomman	
538. Jonathan, John F.	5-18-10	Air Compressor Operator	
539. Jones, Richard K.	8-27-26	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
540. Juneby, James A.	7-10-26	Laborer	
541. Juneby, Willy	12-14-12	Laborer	
542. Kambolov, Sam A.	5-5-97	Fireman	Grade 2
543. Kaufman, Lorenz U.C.	5-15-08	Truck Driver	Grade 1
544. Kelley, Reese H.	2-4-15	Foreman	Grade 2
545. Kelley, Richard G.	3-30-36	Shovel Operator	Grade 1
546. Kennedy, Thomas S.	6-21-08	Grader Operator	Grade 1
547. Kimmel, Donald C.	7-12-30	Truck Driver	Grade 2
548. Knudsen, Gale C.	12-8-33	Tractor Operator	Grade 1
549. Koski, John S.	11-3-91	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
550. Kuth, Paul W.	9-14-12	Grader Operator	Grade 2
551. Lader, John P.	11-8-18	Cook	Grade 3
552. Larsen, Clyde	4-15-12	Truck Driver	Grade 2
553. Lee, Lena H.	3-3-10	Laborer	
554. Lee, Paul M.	5-9-12	Truck Driver	Grade 2
555. Lefferson, William H.	3-5-27	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
556. Lewis, Ray R.	2-16-14	Shovel Operator	Grade 2
557. Liston, Edward J.	9-1-92	Carpenter	
558. Lounsbury, Lloyd P.	10-26-10	Foreman, Mechanic	
559. Lubbe, William J.	12-29-1900	Foreman	Grade 3
560. Luke, Frank	5-10-96	Laborer	
561. Luke, Tim W.	6-11-35	Truck Driver	Grade 2
562. Lutro, Arthur P.	3-11-95	Foreman	Grade 2
563. McGinnis, Raymond M.	5-25-14	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	

FAIRBANKS DISTRICT - WAGEBOARD (continued)

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Grade</u>
564. McGovern, Merle A.	10-26-18	Partsman	
565. Malcolm, Mathew	9-7-26	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
566. Manyard, Herbert Lee	10-19-30	Truck Driver	Grade 2
567. Martin, William	4-8-98	Laborer	
568. Matthews, Arthur D.	4-3-20	Warehouseman	
569. Mattson, John L.	1-19-12	Mechanic, Automotive	
570. Mayo, Edward	7-16-12	Laborer	
571. Meinhart, Jack A.	2-17-17	Truck Driver	Grade 2
572. Messerschmidt, Elmer H.	8-9-10	Electrician	
573. Mock, Carl O.	5-1-08	Truck Driver	Grade 2
574. Molchan, Michael A.	2-8-20	Oiler	
575. Moore, James E.	9-10-26	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
576. Moore, Norman H.	5-6-18	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
577. Moratzka, Earl C.	7-3-04	Truck Driver	Grade 2
578. Morency, Daniel A.	12-31-03	Asphalt Distributor Operator	
579. Morris, Roosevelt	12-22-05	Truck Driver	Grade 2
580. Morton, George H.	10-26-01	Foreman, General	
581. Myers, Charles H.	10-13-09	Cook	Grade 3
582. Nelsen, Andrew P.	8-24-01	Foreman, General	
583. Nelson, Harold C.	5-5-10	Grader Operator	Grade 2
584. Nelson, John E.	11-11-01	Grader Operator	Grade 2
585. O'Day, James V.	1-28-13	Truck Driver	Grade 2
586. O'Harra, Kenneth E.	7-11-10	Truck Driver	Grade 2
587. Ohman, Louie	11-4-19	Partsman Supervisor	
588. Olson, Roy E.	1-27-10	Foreman, Warehouse	
589. Parkison, Elmer L.	11-21-16	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
590. Patton, Clarence J.	11-4-21	Truck Driver	Grade 2
591. Paul, Bailey D.	5-8-25	Truck Driver	Grade 1
592. Paul, Eldred M.	6-25-35	Laborer	
593. Paul, Julius	8-27-16	Wagon Drill Operator	
594. Paul, Robert F.	4-14-36	Truck Driver	Grade 2
595. Peterson, Mary A.	4-24-96	Cook	Grade 3
596. Peyton, Edwin E.	6-6-05	Foreman	Grade 3
597. Picard, Francis E.	2-3-07	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
598. Platt, Leonard H.	3-16-16	Carpenter	
599. Popp, Charles F.	5-26-30	Mechanic, Automotive	
600. Pruett, Glen W.	11-16-13	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
601. Race, Lester O.	8-7-22	Foreman, Mechanic	
602. Revells, John E.	11-26-22	Shovel Operator	Grade 2
603. Richardson, Asher B.	5-3-07	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	

FAIRBANKS DISTRICT - WAGEBOARD (continued)

Name	Date of Birth	Title	Grade
604. Rivard, Gerard J.	12-28-13	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
605. Roberts, Curtis O.	3-24-1900	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
606. Roberts, Sandy	10-17-1900	Laborer	
607. Rolfe, Walter H.	5-29-08	Radio Repairman	
608. Sanford, Ralph A.	10-15-15	Grader Operator	Grade 2
609. Sanford, Walter	1-20-21	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
610. Savela, John E.	7-4-04	Mechanic, District	
611. Savela, Raynold I.	3-6-25	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
612. Schultz, Donald E.	2-13-04	Grader Operator	Grade 2
613. Sexton, Frank E.	11-12-21	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
614. Shannon, John M.	11-18-06	Tire Repairman	
615. Shores, Claris D.	1-17-04	Timekeeper	
616. Simmons, William E.	1-11-28	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
617. Simpkin, Richard J.	1-24-14	Grader Operator	Grade 2
618. Sloper, Harold C.	9-3-33	Warehouseman	
619. Smith, Robert E.	12-13-03	Grader Operator	Grade 2
620. Snow, Arthur C.	1-20-05	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
621. Solka, Richardson	12-16-16	Electrician	
622. Somaduroff, Robert E.	4-10-37	Truck Driver	Grade 1
623. Squiqui, Bert O.	10-23-04	Mechanic, Automotive	
624. Stegemeyer, William D.	12-22-21	Partsman	
625. Stevens, Arthur	11-4-04	Laborer	
626. Stolp, Gus R.	5-22-02	Foreman	Grade 2
627. Stout, Earl	8-7-91	Grader Operator	Grade 2
628. Strother, William H.	1-22-28	Truck Driver	Grade 1
629. Stroud, Rayford R.	11-13-15	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
630. Sundberg, Mattias	11-3-91	Cook	Grade 3
631. Sundstrom, Clarence L.	7-15-12	Machinist	
632. Swanson, James T.	2-25-12	Shovel Operator	Grade 2
633. Swatch, George T.	1-1-19	Truck Driver	Grade 2
634. Sweetsir, Lester A.	10-23-12	Foreman	Grade 2
635. Tatum, Eugene E.	4-11-19	Truck Driver	Grade 2
636. Taylor, Arley R.	11-6-10	Shovel Operator	Grade 2
637. Terwilliger, Fred	4-23-01	Grader Operator	Grade 1
638. Tisor, Daniel G.	9-14-02	Carpenter	
639. Valentine, David B.	7-11-37	Truck Driver	Grade 1
640. Wade, Jack	2-26-11	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
641. Walter, Ray M.	6-5-06	Body and Fender Repairman	
642. Wantland, Robert E.	4-4-26	Tractor Operator	Grade 1
643. Ward, Arlie M.	1-21-03	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	

FAIRBANKS DISTRICT - WAGEBOARD (continued)

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Grade</u>
644. Ward, Charles Wm. C.	12-26-16	Truck Driver	Grade 2
645. Watson, Charles L.	10-22-36	Laborer	
646. Wood, Richard C., Jr.	12-18-20	Truck Driver	Grade 2
647. Woods, Charles D., Jr.	4-18-21	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
648. Woods, Frederick	11-20-18	Fireman	Grade 2
649. Woodward, George N.	4-13-02	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
650. Young, Dewey L.	11-13-97	Foreman	Grade 2
651. Yrjana, Albert M.	1-15-10	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
652. Zurek, Walery J.	6-25-11	Truck Driver	Grade 1

VALDEZ DISTRICT - CLASSIFIED

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Series-Grade</u>
653. Anderson, Halbert E.	8-30-08	Highway Constr. Engineer	GS-823-9
654. Arndt, Bruce E.	3-2-17	Highway Engineer	GS-820-7
655. Coleman, Earl L.	4-19-1900	Administrative Assistant	GS-301-9
656. Cooley, John M.	4-22-19	Highway Engineer	GS-820-13
657. Divine, Andrew C.	11-10-07	Highway Constr. Engineer	GS-823-11
658. Fichtenau, Robert L.	10-9-28	Supv. Constr. Insp. (Gen.)	GS-1871-8
659. Griggs, Margaret L.	2-8-08	Prop. & Stock Control Clk.	GS-2040-5
660. Harding, Frederick H.	4-6-31	Highway Engineer	GS-820-7
661. Haseltin, Earl S.	12-6-1900	Administrative Officer	GS-301-11
662. Hawkins, Harrison	2-4-1900	Highway Constr. Engineer	GS-823-11
663. Henderson, Catherine M.	2-23-22	Secretary (Stenography)	GS-318-4
664. Henrie, Ralph D.	12-7-17	Supv. Engr. Aid (Civil)	GS-802-7
665. Hess, Joseph W.	3-15-27	Highway Engineer	GS-820-7
666. Hoback, Grace L.	2-26-19	Clerk (General)(Stenography)	GS-301-6
667. Hough, Lawrence E.	5-9-06	Highway Constr. Engineer	GS-823-11
668. Joy, Laura L.	9-20-17	Prop. & Stock Control Clk.	GS-2040-4
669. Kasson, James W.	9-12-23	Highway Constr. Engineer	GS-823-9
670. Kuhns, Ray	4-29-96	Highway Engineer	GS-820-12
671. Long, Helen L.	9-27-12	Prop. & Stock Control Clk.	GS-2040-6
672. Martin, Darrel	4-16-30	Supv. Engr. Aid (Civil)	GS-802-7
673. Minish, Phyllis A.	10-10-23	Accounting & Fiscal Clerk	GS-501-4
674. Moore, Robert L.	1-12-28	Supv. Engr. Aid (Civil)	GS-802-6
675. Ness, Florence R.	11-1-16	Time, Leave & Payroll Clk.	GS-544-4
676. Ratekin, Chester M	10-13-12	Construction Inspector	GS-1871-8
677. Sanderson, Wilfred A.	10-31-12	Highway Engineer	GS-820-7
678. Simmons, Jerry E.	8-2-28	Engineer Aid (Civil)	GS-802-6
679. Slone, Alvin	8-13-29	Materials Engineer	GS-806-7
680. Sullivan, Russell A.	8-24-99	Prop. & Supply Supervisor	GS-2040-9
681. Thatcher, Hubert D.	6-29-08	Highway Design Engineer	GS-822-9
682. Vail, Kathleen I.	3-17-27	Accounting & Fiscal Clerk	GS-501-6

VALDEZ DISTRICT - CLASSIFIED (continued)

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Series-Grade</u>
683. Walker, Lawrence L.	8-18-24	Constr. Inspector (Gen.)	GS-1871-9
684. Wafford, Lorene D.	12-8-08	Time, Leave & Payroll Clk.	GS-544-4
685. White, Robert O.	4-15-24	Materials Engineer	GS-806-9
686. Wilcox, John R.	4-4-09	Highway Constr. Engineer	GS-823-11

VALDEZ DISTRICT - UNCLASSIFIED

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Grade</u>
687. Beck, Edward J.	6-5-28	Civil Engineering Aid	6
688. Borgen, Edward W., Jr.	1-14-39	Civil Engineering Aid (Trainee)	2
689. Brandon, Victor C.	9-19-26	Civil Engineering Aid	5
690. Carroll, John R.	2-23-19	Civil Engineering Aid	7
691. Dipzinski, Charles L.	11-4-36	Civil Engineering Aid	2
692. Eckman, William L.	3-25-18	Civil Engineering Aid	2
693. Gallup, Robert D.	8-25-34	Civil Engineering Aid	5
694. Goodman, James L.	11-10-35	Civil Engineering Aid	3
695. Gregory, Kenneth R.	2-19-29	Civil Engineering Aid	5
696. Hall, David H.	10-14-31	Civil Engineering Aid	3
697. Huddleston, Neil A., Jr.	11-1-34	Civil Engineering Aid	2
698. Jordan, Franklin	7-4-35	Civil Engineering Aid	2
699. Kurtz, James H.	4-13-34	Civil Engineering Aid	5
700. McQueary, Chester F.	8-19-36	Civil Engineering Aid	3
701. Malkmus, William H.	2-3-35	Civil Engineering Aid	4
702. Markham, Don F.	10-29-34	Civil Engineering Aid	3
703. Morgan, Ray D.	12-4-26	Civil Engineering Aid	4
704. Nordquist, Eugene G.	10-6-31	Civil Engineering Aid	5
705. Pett, Lillian D.	5-9-1900	Civil Engineering Aid	4
706. Pressley, Norman D.	9-10-27	Civil Engineering Aid	3
707. Rice, Alfred J.	6-20-31	Civil Engineering Aid	7
708. Rittenhouse, Donald L.	11-15-27	Civil Engineering Aid	5
709. Snell, Jack C.	7-25-25	Civil Engineering Aid	2
710. Stoltenberg, Louis H.	7-16-38	Civil Engineering Aid	2
711. White, Youthford	11-24-04	Civil Engineering Aid	6
712. Wright, Frank L.	3-3-36	Civil Engineering Aid	5

VALDEZ DISTRICT - WAGEBOARD

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Grade</u>
713. Barnes, William L.	12-23-28	Utility Repairman	
714. Bell, Earl V.	3-12-33	Oiler	
715. Bell, Henry	6-25-14	Truck Driver	Grade 2
716. Bell, Lloyd A.	8-12-10	Truck Driver	Grade 2
717. Billum, Frank	3-17-15	Toolroomman	

VALDEZ DISTRICT - WAGEBOARD (continued)

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Grade</u>
718. Blackburn, Hugh H.	9-14-01	Truck Driver	Grade 2
719. Brenwick, Leonard	9-15-15	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
720. Buck, William H.	3-7-21	Carpenter	
721. Butcher, Charles L.	3-10-10	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
722. Carter, Arnold H.	3-13-31	Mechanic, Automotive	
723. Champoux, Joseph F.	12-30-11	Electrician	
724. Charley, Walter	2-24-08	Mechanic, Helper, Heavy Duty	
725. Chase, Marvan A.	12-25-09	Body and Fender Repairman	
726. Coats, John D.	5-12-25	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
727. Colyer, Douglas E.	10-28-13	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
728. Corteville, Stanford C.	12-3-16	Machinist	
729. Craig, Oscar J.	2-5-07	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
730. Cutshall, Max H.	2-21-27	Foreman	Grade 3
731. Demientieff, Michael	12-6-29	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
732. Deskins, James E.	10-16-08	Foreman	Grade 2
733. Deskins, Joann	4-12-14	Cook	Grade 3
734. DeSpain, Clifford F.	8-15-98	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
735. Devish, Jack	7-15-92	Laborer	
736. Dewing, George R.	5-20-05	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
737. Dieringer, Joseph C.	11-17-19	Pumping Plant Operator	
738. Dimonde, Joseph F.	1-1-18	Body and Fender Repairman	
739. Donovan, John P.	12-29-01	Tire Repair Supervisor	
740. Dyer, William A.	4-10-11	Foreman, Warehouse	
741. Ekemo, John F.	4-23-20	Foreman	Grade 2
742. Erickson, Walter N.	7-2-07	Grader Operator	Grade 2
743. Ewan, Fred	8-15-16	Tournapull Operator	
744. Ewan, Hector	12-23-32	Truck Driver	Grade 1
745. Ewan, Markle F.	3-15-18	Grader Operator	Grade 1
746. Fisher, Leo A.	5-26-15	Fireman	Grade 2
747. Fleming, Douglas M.	10-27-27	Partsman	
748. Flickinger, Glen	4-6-09	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
749. Flower, Arlington C.	6-16-11	Grader Operator	Grade 2
750. Frederick, Richard R.	6-29-22	Grader Operator	Grade 2
751. Gene, Buster B.	12-15-10	Laborer	
752. George, August R.	10-10-1900	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
753. George, Bacille	12-17-05	Painter	
754. Goodman, Clarence L.	4-3-06	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
755. Gunderson, Harold	10-14-04	Foreman	Grade 3
756. Gustafson, Leo H.	1-30-16	Foreman	Grade 2
757. Harris, Leo. P.	1-19-25	Foreman	Grade 2

VALDEZ DISTRICT - WAGEBOARD (continued)

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Grade</u>
758. Harris, Michael J.	12-3-32	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
759. Hassinen, Theodore O.	7-29-05	Truck Driver	Grade 2
760. Heaton, William K.	11-23-23	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
761. Hayden, Guy B.	1-1-99	Foreman, Mechanic	
762. Heintz, Harry J.	10-19-12	Truck Driver	Grade 2
763. Henderson, John T.	8-25-04	Fireman	Grade 2
764. Hoagland, Oscar W.	3-6-87	Truck Driver	Grade 1
765. Hobson, Frank	7-2-01	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
766. Hobson, Harry	12-22-02	Pumping Plant Operator	
767. Howie, David M.	7-8-02	Foreman	Grade 2
768. Howie, Thomas L.D.	9-17-16	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
769. Huddleston, Raymond	10-2-08	Foreman, General	
770. Iverson, George S.	10-6-97	Grader Operator	Grade 2
771. Jankowski, Walter J.	6-18-19	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
772. Jewett, Raymond V.	7-14-95	Plumber-Steamfitter	
773. Johns, Harry A.	11-9-09	Mechanic, Automotive	
774. Johnson, Donald R.	5-10-36	Truck Driver	Grade 2
775. Johnson, Einar	12-29-88	Powderman	
776. Jongejan, Thomas, Jr.	10-4-22	Truck Driver	Grade 2
777. Kvalvik, Henry N.	10-19-13	Partsman Supervisor	
778. Kvalvik, Mary	12-17-22	Timekeeper	
779. Lamier, Albert C.	3-10-08	Plumber-Steamfitter	
780. Lane, Ralph B.	7-29-34	Grader Operator	Grade 2
781. Leedle, Robert L.	10-8-05	Foreman	Grade 2
782. Lind, John A., Jr.	2-17-12	Radio Repairman	
783. Luebke, Jerome G.	3-17-20	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
784. McAllister, Robert A.	11-3-29	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
785. McCrary, Roy W.	3-30-27	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
786. McKinley, Jim	5-3-99	Painter	
787. McLeod, Bruce B.	8-2-14	Asphalt Plant Operator	
788. Marshall, Robert	4-11-22	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
789. Meier, John B.	1-5-13	Mechanic, Automotive	
790. Meserini, Luigi	4-21-97	Laborer	
791. Moog, Ellis A.	7-15-03	Fireman	Grade 2
792. Morner, John A.	3-2-09	Partsman	
793. Mullins, Gehu	2-7-14	Fireman	Grade 2
794. Neeley, Ben T.	2-28-14	Grader Operator	Grade 1
795. Nelson, Howard L.	2-10-11	Grader Operator	Grade 2
796. Obey, Gordon R.	10-14-28	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
797. Olson, Dorothy	1-18-1900	Cook	Grade 3

VALDEZ DISTRICT - WAGEBOARD (continued)

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Grade</u>
798. Olson, Olaf K.	6-6-04	Grader Operator	Grade 2
799. Peneff, Penio	9-15-88	Laborer	
800. Perrett, Clifford L.	6-25-14	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
801. Peterson, Cornell B.	9-16-04	Laborer	
802. Peterson, George F.	9-23-15	Foreman	Grade 2
803. Poulin, Archie	2-8-84	Carpenter	
804. Prater, Herschel C.	10-7-09	Warehouseman	
805. Rickey, Kenneth J.	1-26-01	Truck Driver	Grade 2
806. Robinson, Bruce	3-6-22	Shovel Operator	Grade 2
807. Rogers, Claude E.	1-25-12	Foreman, General	
808. Ryan, Peter	11-5-05	Fireman	Grade 2
809. Scott, Harry	3-7-97	Fireman	Grade 2
810. Sharpe, Ira H.	5-15-11	Truck Driver	Grade 2
811. Speerstra, Harry F.	1-25-21	Mechanic, Automotive	
812. Stahlnecker, J. David	8-28-27	Mechanic, Automotive	
813. Striegel, Alois H.	4-4-04	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
814. Striegel, John E.	2-12-33	Truck Driver	Grade 2
815. Sullivan, Paul T.	10-11-13	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
816. Sycks, Vernon D.	10-30-29	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
817. Thomas, Dwight M.	4-5-98	District Mechanic	
818. Tibbits, Archie C.	8-9-91	District Mechanic	
819. Vigdahl, David C.	12-7-01	Foreman	Grade 2
820. Ward, Ralph	9-28-05	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
821. Wilcox, Charles F.	2-4-12	Partsman Supervisor	
822. Williams, Ralph E.	1-7-15	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
823. Woodman, Isaac N.	12-9-1900	Tractor Operator	Grade 2

NOME DISTRICT - CLASSIFIED

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Series-Grade</u>
824. Edman, Grace E.	12-16-13	Administrative Officer	GS-301-10
825. Morris, Frank	11-29-21	Highway Engineer	GS-820-12
826. Waldhelm, Ellen E.	4-23-29	Accounting & Fiscal Clerk	GS-501-5

NOME DISTRICT - WAGEBOARD

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Grade</u>
827. Adams, Henry W.	6-5-17	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
828. Adams, Milton	10-10-90	Ferryman	
829. Ahwinona, Samuel	12-10-24	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
830. Ball, Ernest G.	3-4-12	Mechanic, Automotive	
831. Bell, George E.	12-14-35	Grader Operator	Grade 1

NOME DISTRICT - WAGEBOARD (continued)

Name	Date of Birth	Title	Grade
832. Bernhardt, Herman, Sr.	12-11-07	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
833. Bourn, Harry	4-6-80	Foreman	Grade 2
834. Carroll, Jerry	11-6-99	Foreman	Grade 1
835. Castel, Aarnout, Jr.	11-24-30	Mechanic Helper, Heavy Duty	
836. Cherry, Henry D.	1-10-01	Truck Driver	Grade 2
837. Crosby, Bernard L.	8-17-02	Foreman	Grade 2
838. Curran, Peter J., Jr.	11-30-05	Ferryman	
839. Emmons, Robert R.	6-18-22	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
840. Finch, Norris L.	6-6-25	Truck Driver	Grade 2
841. Foltz, Richard D.	3-31-32	Tractor Operator	Grade 1
842. Friesz, Walter E.	12-11-24	Mechanic, Automotive	
843. Geamalis, George K.	1884	Cook	Grade 3
844. Hoogendorn, Jack	7-5-13	Foreman	Grade 1
845. Joe, Robert K.	7-13-27	Truck Driver	Grade 2
846. Johnson, Arthur E.	3-3-08	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
847. Kagoona, Herbert	4-9-33	Tournapull Operator	
848. Kagoona, Perry, Jr.	5-3-31	Tractor Operator	Grade 1
849. Kokochuruk, Job N.	4-8-17	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
850. Lancaster, Phillip R.	6-30-96	Foreman, Warehouse	
851. Larsen, Isaac M.	8-26-32	Tractor Operator	Grade 1
852. Lean, Clements N.	9-24-21	Foreman	Grade 3
853. Lewis, Charles F.	12-15-20	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
854. Lyle, Donald J.	8-10-05	District Mechanic	
855. Martin, Albert J.	6-4-12	Laborer	
856. Martin, Frankie, Jr.	2-12-32	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
857. Mickelson, Carl O.	2-16-04	Mechanic Supervisor	
858. Moses, Oswald	12-10-16	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
859. Nershak, Clyde	7-15-33	Truck Driver	Grade 2
860. Norbert, John	11-5-05	Foreman	Grade 2
861. Norbert, John P., Jr.	3-28-33	Mechanic Helper, Heavy Duty	
862. Olson, John L.	3-26-12	Mechanic Helper, Heavy Duty	
863. Otton, David	12-10-19	Mechanic Helper, Heavy Duty	
864. Pasquan, Albert	6-3-14	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
865. Paul, Charles	3-11-28	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
866. Simon, Walter	6-22-14	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
867. Trigg, Clarence G.	5-6-33	Foreman	Grade 2
868. Trigg, Jerome	8-6-14	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
869. Turner, Everett S.	2-3-30	Tournapull Operator	
870. Wheeler, Myron	9-24-35	Truck Driver	Grade 2

HAINES SUB-DISTRICT - CLASSIFIED

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Series-Grade</u>
871. Comstock, Karl O.	12-9-11	Administrative Assistant	GS-301-7
872. Fox, John C.	2-3-19	Highway Construction Engr.	GS-823-11

HAINES SUB-DISTRICT - WAGEBOARD

873. Ackerman, Lynn W.	9-27-18	Foreman	Grade 2
874. Albecker, Leo R.	3-31-14	Truck Driver	Grade 1
875. Gulliford, Herbert G.	2-1-17	Partsman	
876. Helms, Thomas	9-22-19	Laborer	
877. Matthews, Clifford F.	4-15-24	Tractor Operator	Grade 1
878. McRae, Fred H.	1-2-11	Foreman	Grade 3
879. Mellott, Eddie L.	1-7-1900	Grader Operator	Grade 2
880. Nowell, Forest J.	4-27-12	Mechanic, Heavy Duty	
881. Rorex, John M.	6-9-20	Laborer	
882. Sheppard, Warren E.	8-14-12	Truck Driver	Grade 2
883. Smith, Marvin L.	12-4-25	Truck Driver	Grade 2
884. Thompson, John W.	11-27-14	Shovel Operator	Grade 2
885. Ward, Thomas A.	5-18-26	Tractor Operator	Grade 2
886. Lundy, George, Sr.	9-16-91	Truck Driver	Grade 1
887. Oehler, David M.	8-11-26	Truck Driver	Grade 1

ADDITIONS TO FAIRBANKS DISTRICT - CLASSIFIED

888. Eyres, David L.	7-3-31	Highway Engineer	GS-820-7
889. Pluntze, James C.	7-27-31	Engineering Aid (Civil)	GS-802-6

ADDITIONS TO JUNEAU HEADQUARTERS - WAGEBOARD

890. White, Harry O. 11-17-96 Master Mechanic

A.I. Ghiglione, Director
ALASKA ROAD COMMISSION
Commerce-B.P.R.-Juneau, Alaska

Robley Winfrey, Chief
Personnel & Training
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

Source: 62-A-1283, box 65, R.G.30, Washington National Records Center, Suitland, Maryland.

9. A.C. Clark to F.C. Turner, September 19, 1956, 62-A-1283, box 65, R.G. 30, Washington Federal Records Center, Suitland, Maryland.

10. Ibid.

11. Ibid.

12. Irving Reed to Sinclair Weeks, September 21, 1956, 62-A-1283, box 65, R.G. 30, Washington Federal Records Center, Suitland, Maryland.
13. A.C. Clark to C.D. Curtiss, October 4, 1956, 62-A-1283, box 65, R.G. 30, Washington Federal Records Center, Suitland, Maryland.
14. Irving Reed to Sinclair Weeks, September 21, 1956, A.C. Clark to C.D. Curtiss, October 4, 1956, 62-A-1283, box 65, R.G. 30, Washington Federal Records Center, Suitland, Maryland.
15. Act of July 30, 1886 and 48 U.S.C.A. 321. A.C. Clark to C.D. Curtiss, October 4, 1956, 62-A-1283, box 65, R.G. 30, Washington Federal Records Center, Suitland, Maryland.
16. Irving Reed to Sinclair Weeks, September 21, 1956, C.W. Phillips to S.K. Booth, November 1, 1956, 62-A-1283, box 65, R.G. 30, Washington Federal Records Center, Suitland, Maryland.
17. Mary Lee Council to Frank C. Turner, September 25, 1956, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 5, Federal Departments and Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska; Mass Transfer of Employees From Alaska Road Commission to the Bureau of Public Roads, September 16, 1956, 62-A-1283, box 65, R.G. 30, Washington Federal Records Center, Suitland, Maryland.
18. "Alaska and the Federal-Aid Highway Program," speech by Edward Margolin, special assistant to the Undersecretary of Commerce for Transportation, delivered to the annual convention of the League of Alaskan Cities in Ketchikan on November 1, 1956, E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 5, Federal Departments and Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska.
19. Ibid.
20. Ibid.

21. Ibid.
22. Ibid.
23. Ibid.
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid.
26. Ibid.
27. Irving Reed to Charles D. Curtiss, November 23, 1956, 62-A-1283, box 65, R.G. 30, Washington Federal Records Center, Suitland, Maryland.
28. Press Release, BPR, November 16, 1956, A.F. Ghiglione to Frank Turner, December 20, 1956, 62-A-1283, box 65, R.G. 30, Washington Federal Records Center, Suitland, Maryland.
29. Ibid.

THE PLAN FOR A TAKU RIVER VALLEY ROAD

In the summer of 1957, F.E. Baxter, the supervising highway engineer of the Bureau of Public Roads in Juneau transferred a very bulky file consisting of all the survey and design data on the Taku Route to Chr. F. Wyller, the Bureau of Public Roads district engineer in Juneau. The data covered the road south of Thane near Juneau to Yehring Creek approximately 10 miles south of the Canadian boundary on the Taku River, consisting of cross section and mass diagram rolls, hardshell and profile rolls; small scale traverses, right-of-way maps, bridge and miscellaneous rolls; field and miscellaneous books and various other materials, such as a Taku River traverse, superelevation tables, loops and bench marks, earthwork, and miscellaneous triangulation sheets.¹

Engineers in the Region 10 office of the Bureau of Public Roads obviously were interested in determining the feasibility of the Taku Route for inclusion in the federal aid highway program. The concept for a trail or road from tide water on the Taku River to the International Boundary and from there of an international route to Atlin in British Columbia, Canada, dated back to the last decade of the 19th century. As early as 1892, the Canadian government had instructed one Gauvreau to undertake a survey expedition into the northern parts of British Columbia. The group consisted of six men and one packer. Captain Wm. Moore, an American, was a member of the expedition. A few years later, in 1897, he founded Skagway, called "The Gateway to the Golden Interior," after gold had been discovered in 1896 near Dawson on the Yukon River in Canada's Yukon Territory. Moore had a cabin near the mouth of the Skagway River, and the town he founded soon served as a base of operations for thousands of prospectors during the

hectic Klondike gold rush of 1897-98. It became Alaska's largest town for a few short years.

In early 1894, however, Moore testified before a Canadian "Select Committee to Enquire Into Conduct And Management Of The Gauvreau Expedition '92." The captain claimed that the expedition had been mismanaged by the leader. Specifically, he charged that the route taken was useless for marking a trail. The party had been charged to reach the 60th Parallel, but never even got close to it. Gauvreau had purchased pack animals instead of hiring Indians. The captain insisted that "there was never an expedition went out there that had no Indians: all explorers who have been through that country have hired Indians to pack and no trouble to get them--at Wrangel, or Telegraph Creek, or anywhere there." In addition, expedition members had spent 34 days in camp at Egnell's Flat, wasting time, "eating and drinking--getting fat--and Mr. Gauvreau was doing the same thing others were taking small excursions and helped the packer." About June 5 the party moved to another camp at Hudson's Bay Flat and stayed there until July 10. Gauvreau left the expedition for 34 days and went to Telegraph Creek and Wrangell and Juneau. In the meantime, the party went about 60 miles from Hudson's Bay Flat to the bridge on the Taku River, surveying a possible route.²

At the forks of the Taku River the party camped again. Moore insisted that it was within a four or five day canoe trip from the Chilkoot and White Passes. Instead of attempting this journey, Gauvreau went down the Taku River on to Juneau, up Lynn Canal and then crossed the Chilkoot Pass which already had been explored by such eminent Dominion men as Ogilvie and Dawson. It was an expensive journey, little had been accomplished, and Moore felt that the Dominion government had not received fair value for its

expenditures.³ It is not known if the Dominion government chastised Gauvreau.

Nine years later, on November 22, 1902, Captain Moore wrote to a Canadian government official in Victoria, B.C., informing him that he had been accumulating information on the northern parts of British Columbia and Alaska since 1862. Moore told of having built roads in different localities and explored much territory. As a result he had come to believe that the area contained large gold and other mineral deposits. The captain now intended to outfit and accompany a prospecting party to the headwaters of the Pelly and Nisutlin Rivers, entering by way of the Stikeen River. If he succeeded in finding sufficient quantities of gold or other minerals, Moore proposed that the Canadian government grant him a charter to build a 350 mile toll road from a branch of the Stikine River to one of the tributaries of the Nisutlin or Pelly Rivers. The captain also proposed to operate steamships from British Columbia ports to a port on the Stikeen River, in the Cassiar district, "without breaking bulk of cargo, or clashing with American Customs." The project required thousands of dollars, "too much for an individual to undertake, without some little assistance from your Government, and also concessions, to such an extent as might seem proper or within the power of the Government to give...." If an agreement was reached, Moore was prepared "to give good and sufficient Bonds to carry out my part." He assured the official that he did not attempt to involve the government in any scheme but rather a legitimate enterprise, "and one in which I propose to assume a large portion of the burden myself." All he needed was a little assistance, protection, and encouragement. If successful, he hoped to "derive such benefits from the venture as my foresight and enterprise justifies."⁴

The Canadian government responded quickly and asked Moore what kind of assistance he needed and the nature of the concessions required. Moore explained that he intended to hire eight men and purchase a suitable outfit, supplies, and pack animals. He planned to devote two or three years to the undertaking, opening up a new mining district, "alike of benefit to myself and the Government, subsequently to enlarge the trails into wagon roads, build necessary bridges, and put on a line of steamers...." Since this plan necessitated the outlay of several thousands of dollars, and the investment "of a much larger amount of capital," Moore desired "to secure in advance the assurance that a concession would be granted me...." Specifically, he asked that each of the men as well as he himself, be granted the right of one claim each, 1,000 feet long and 600 feet wide, "on each creek, gulch, bench, hill or river in the province of British Columbia or the Yukon Territory, staked by us, provided of course that before such location we find gold in paying quantities." In order to reach these prospective mining areas, Moore estimated that he would have to spend between \$5,000 to \$7,000 for the construction of trails, roads and bridges. He asked that once he had demonstrated to the government the legitimate nature of the project that he be reimbursed for the cost of the trails, roads, and bridges, "as are shown to be of actual public utility."⁵ It is not known if Moore's project ever got underway or if the Canadian government granted the requested concessions.

What is known is that the Alaska Road Commission ordered a preliminary survey for a trail or road from tide water on the Taku River to the International Boundary. From there a general investigation was to be conducted on the upper waters of the Taku River, exploring the feasibility of an international trail or road from the mouth of the Taku River to Atlin in

British Columbia. Location engineer R.J. Shepard undertook the survey in the summer of 1921, and delivered his report on October 31 of that year.⁶

Shepard reported that the airline distance from Carcross on the White Pass and Yukon Railway to the mouth of the Stikine River was about 250 miles. He opined that the Taku River Valley offered the only feasible route from tide water to the interior between these two points. It was entirely undeveloped. The Taku River drainage encompassed about 100 square miles. The area was unpopulated. A handful of trappers in the winter and a few prospectors and hunting parties in the summer visited the region. Individuals had staked a few homesteads on or near tidewater. With the exception of one homestead at the landing owned by one Bullard little development work had been performed. A Native fishing village was located near the mouth of the river, but it was deserted except during the fishing season. Furs trapped on the headwaters of the Taku River were usually transported north to Atlin or south to Telegraph. Teamsters transported supplies along the telegraph line north from Telegraph as far as Nakina, some 60 miles distant from Atlin. The Taku River Valley provided the natural outlet for this entire region, and also offered the most feasible route for either a road or railroad connecting Atlin and the coast. Shepard noted that he had been able to obtain but very little information about the vast region to the east and north, including the Lake Teslin district, the Dease Lake country and the Valley of the Liard River. At Atlin he had talked with a few men who had visited these regions and concluded that no great natural obstacles prevented connecting these districts with the Taku River Valley by trail or road. In 1921, pack horse trains through Telegraph supplied these districts.⁷

Shepard had followed the south bank of the Taku River in making his preliminary location to the boundary. From Bullard's Landing to the boundary it was 16 miles. Starting at the Landing, 3 miles of road had been completed and an additional 10,000 feet of right-of-way cleared. The road had never been used and the right-of-way was quickly disappearing beneath new growth. About 2.5 miles above Bullard's Landing the road crew had left "a good 18 x 24 foot one story log building with out houses and a three stall stable." The cleared right-of-way ended at a stream about 300 feet wide at high water. Of the 13 miles of location between the end of the existing road and the boundary, about 10 miles was on level land and the remaining 3 miles went along a hill with a side slope of from 20 to 60 percent. Of this, about 500 feet was located in solid rock.⁸

Shepard traveled next from the boundary to Atlin but did not make a reconnaissance road location but rather intended to get a feel for the country and to determine which side of the river the Canadian government could use for trail or road construction to connect with the existing short stretch. He found the south bank of the Taku River the most suitable because the Taku Glacier at its mouth made it impossible to make a connection to deep water; it was too expensive to bridge the Tulsequah River about 5 miles above the boundary; and the existing three miles of road lay on the south bank.⁹

The distance from the boundary to the junction of the Inklin and Nakina Rivers was 40 miles. For about 10 miles, the river cut closely against the foot of the mountains, necessitating side cut work. For the next 30 miles the road would follow level, heavily timbered terrain, or hillsides where grading would require principally excavation work. Just below the junction of the Inklin and Nakina Rivers there was a crossing of

not more than 400 feet in width. The distance from there to the mouth of the Silver Salmon River was about 25 miles. The left bank of the river afforded the best route, and if used, the Sloko River would have to be bridged, a stream width of about 300 feet. Of these 25 miles, at least 5 miles required heavy work, much of it in solid rock, while 15 miles would necessitate only comparatively light work because the route followed river flats or jackpine benches.¹⁰

From the mouth of the Silver Salmon to Silver Salmon Lake was a distance of approximately 18 miles. For this distance, much sidehill work would be needed, but little solid rock encountered. To connect from Silver Salmon Lake to the Atlin road system, two routes were possible. One 12 mile spur could follow a small stream flowing into Silver Salmon Lake from the north for a distance of about 5 miles, and thence over a low summit connecting with the O'Donnell road, approximately 30 miles from Atlin. Over this distance, a light grade not to exceed five or six percent could be maintained. The second route, about 25 miles long, would parallel the telegraph line, crossing from Silver Salmon to Pike Lake, down the Pike River to near its mouth and thence north to connect with the O'Donnell road about 17 miles from Atlin. The cost of road construction here should be light compared to that in the Taku Valley. Shepard estimated the distance from Bullard's Landing to Atlin to be 143 miles. Sixteen miles lay on the Alaskan side and 127 miles on the Canadian side of the boundary; 30 miles of the O'Donnell road could be utilized on the Canadian side. That, together with the 3 miles within Alaska, left 110 miles to be constructed, if approved.¹¹

Shepard pointed out that the only reason for building the trail or road would be to connect it to a through route from the coast to the Atlin

district. If an automobile road were built for the entire distance its value would be immediate and important. Shepard stated that Atlin's outlet was by boat across Atlin Lake, then by railroad for 3 miles to Graham Inlet, thence by boat down Graham Inlet to Tagish Lake and north along the lake to Carcross, and from there by railroad to Skagway. After freezeup, boat transportation ceased until the ice had become firm enough to permit winter travel, usually not until January of each year. In the spring again travel ceased after the ice became unsafe. Atlin residents had told Shepard that the ice conditions in the lakes shortened the mining season by six weeks. Therefore, an automobile road from Atlin to the mouth of the Taku River would greatly reduce travel time to Juneau and facilitate the handling of the mails and supplies in the spring and early winter. Most importantly, however, tourists would be drawn to the lower Taku Valley, very scenic and abounding in fish and game.¹²

The Alaska Road Commission did not act on Shepard's report, but passed copies to C.H. Flory, the regional forester for the Tongass National Forest, and the Department of Public Works of the Government of the Province of British Columbia. Alaska Road Commission personnel were puzzled when they received an appreciative note eight years later in 1930. Nobody at Alaska Road Commission headquarters in Juneau could recall, nor find, any correspondence on the subject. There seemed to be an interest in Shepard's report and his sketch, because shortly thereafter, the Gold Commissioner of British Columbia requested copies as well and the Alaska Road Commission complied. Early in 1942, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, engaged in constructing the Alcan Highway, from Dawson Creek, B.C. to Big Delta in Alaska requested a copy of Shepard's report. On May 16, 1942 Public Road Administration engineers H.A. Stoddart and J.B. Reher undertook

an aerial reconnaissance of the Atlin Lake-Taku River trail. The two men had studied Shepard's report, and now they wanted to determine the feasibility of building a truck trail to bypass the Whitepass & Yukon Railway which had become a transportation bottleneck in the flow of contractor equipment and supplies for the Alcan Highway. The two men hoped to find a route that could be built at a cost that would be justified in time saved for the construction of the Alcan Highway.¹³

The truck trail was to extend from Marsh Lake which paralleled the route for 15 miles, south via Tagish Lake, Taku Arm, Graham Inlet, Atlin Lake, O'Donnell and Taku Rivers to a point 10 miles from Wright Glacier on tidewater. The part of the route from Marsh Lake to a point 10 miles south of Atlin would utilize tug and barge transportation over a system of lakes. A short portage needed to be built at Taku but there already existed a tramway which could be supplemented by building a one mile road. Construction of a low standard road of 30 miles in length from Atlin Lake to the Nakina River, the two men estimated, should be relatively easy and not exceed \$10,000 per mile. The 10 miles from this point to the Sloko River would cost about \$15,000 per mile. The 50 miles from here to tidewater would be in a narrow canyon with a valley floor nearly covered by a major glacial stream. There were many vertical slopes and rock points over which the trail would have to be built on the face of the cliffs. Construction for this section, exclusive of bridges, would probably cost \$40,000 per mile. Three major timber trestle bridges with a total length of 4,000 feet at a cost of \$400,000 needed to be built. The total length of the route amounted to 180 miles, of which 90 miles needed to be built, at a cost of approximately \$3 million, including the bridges. The two men estimated that it would take two seasons to finish the trail. They

concluded that economic considerations did not justify the project, since the White Pass & Yukon Railway could be expanded to adequate traffic capacity by the addition of \$1 million worth of rolling stock. Therefore, the two men recommended against the construction of the truck trail.¹⁴

In May 1948 W.P. Dunbar of the Consolidated Mining Company of Canada, Ltd., reported to the British Columbia authorities and the Alaska Road Commission on a reconnaissance for a road from tidewater at Swede Point on Taku Inlet to connect with the existing road between the Polaris-Taku mine and their Taku River landing. Dunbar proposed the construction of a wharf about 1,000 feet west from the eastern shore of Taku Glacier Bay. The road would start at the wharf and connect at 27.8 miles with the Polaris-Taku road to the mine's landing at the Canyon Creek crossing, about midway between Polaris-Taku and the landing at the junction of the Tulsequah and Taku Rivers. Dunbar estimated the expense of the project at \$1,160,820, including surveying and engineering work, 8 bridges, and all the necessary excavation, grading, and hauling of gravel. The road bed was to be 12 feet in width with occasional turnouts to accommodate passing traffic. The Polaris-Taku gold mine had begun production in 1938, closed down in 1942, and reopened in 1946. By 1948, it had produced 115,329 ounces of gold, valued at over \$4 million.¹⁵

In early June 1948, John F. Walker, the Deputy Minister of Mines, Department of Mines in Victoria, B.C. alerted R.C. MacDonald, the Minister of Mines, to the Taku River road problem. It was, he pointed out, part of a larger problem, namely how that part of British Columbia inside of the Alaska Panhandle was to be developed. The problem, he insisted, demanded an early definition of policy by the British Columbia government. Walker divided northern British Columbia into four areas and discussed the access

difficulties of each. The topography of the region was such that the provincial government, if interested in fostering economic development, would have to spend money on road construction in United States territory. Existing statutes prohibited such expenditures, but he insisted that "our Mines Act can and will have to be amended to permit expenditure outside the Province on mining roads giving access to mineralized areas within the Province." Otherwise the coastal area could not be developed and that part of British Columbia lying along the Yukon border adjacent to the Alaska Highway could not be developed either except tributary to those points where the highway is within British Columbia.

The British Columbia government discussed the matter with the officials of the mining interests concerned as well as with the federal government in Ottawa. Thereupon, discussions ensued between Ottawa and Washington, D.C. The Americans did not object to have the Canadians build a road through Alaskan territory to give them access to tidewater. Thereupon Ottawa drew up a draft agreement with the provincial government of British Columbia. The whole idea collapsed, however, when the province advised Ottawa that it could not spend money outside of its own territory.¹⁶

In September of that year, the Associated Boards of Trade of Central British Columbia and affiliated Chambers of Commerce of Southeastern Alaska passed a resolution urging the British Columbia provincial and the Canadian federal as well as the United States governments to construct the so-called Hazelton-Whitehorse highway project. Economic and military consideration, they pointed out, demanded the building of this road, originating between Hazelton and New Hazelton, and connecting to the Alaska Highway at Jake's Corner and Whitehorse. The only large-scale undertaking on this route

consisted of crossing the 500 feet wide canyon of the Stikine River. The communities of Stewart, B.C., and Hyder, Wrangell, Petersburg, and Juneau in southeastern Alaska could be connected to the Hazelton Highway. Perhaps most importantly, the boosters stated, the proposed highway would give access "to the great Groundhog anthracite coal fields" and gold, silver, lead, copper and other mineral deposits, as well as "at least half a million acres of first class agricultural land with a mild coast climate plus billions of feet of merchantable timber." The promoters also mentioned the boost to tourism, since the area opened was a very scenic valley "between the majestic Coast Range to the west and the Stikine Ranges, 100 miles deep to the east, with abounding game in the woods and fish in the streams."¹⁷ Neither government responded to the pleas of the chambers of commerce, but at least both the Canadian and American government had been made aware of the Taku-Atlin route.

John R. Noyes, the Commissioner of Roads for Alaska, had been thinking about the project. In a 1949 memorandum to the files, he summarized the history of the proposal and stated that the construction of the Alaska Highway demanded an alternative to the route first surveyed by R.J. Shepard in 1921. Noyes suggested that it follow Shepard's route to the forks of the Nakina and Silver Salmon Rivers. From there it should continue up the Nakina to its headwaters, crossing Ptarmigan Pass; thence down the White Swan River to the head of Teslin Lake and east of the lake by the most practicable route to a connection with the Alaska Highway near Morley River. The total road length would be about 150 miles, about the same as Shepard's estimate, of which all but 20 miles would lie in Canada. Noyes also thought a car ferry should connect Juneau with Taku Inlet, a distance of about 28 miles, where the road began. A few months later, Noyes,

together with Kenneth Kadow, the Director of the Alaska Field Staff, Department of the Interior and B.F. Dunn of Pan American Airways visited the lower Taku River Valley. The party traveled over the existing road from Bullard's Landing to Taku Lodge, and from there by river boat to the second creek Shepard had encountered in 1921. Noyes found Shepard's data to be accurate and concurred that a road along the south side of the river from Taku Lodge to the Boundary could be built. The party also visited the Twin Glacier. Pan American Airways had expressed an interest in development of a summer ski resort on the ice cap. The most practicable way to reach the ice cap was via a cableway. Noyes also found that it was impossible to connect Juneau with the Taku River Valley by road since the front of the Taku Glacier effectively separated the two areas.¹⁸

In March 1950, Juneau's mayor, a representative of a Canadian mining company, and H.A. Stoddart, the division engineer of the Bureau of Public Roads visited Noyes to discuss the possibility of finally building the Taku River road from tidewater to at least the Tulsequah Mining District in British Columbia, and perhaps even further to connect with the newly constructed road at Atlin. Noyes observed that the citizens of southeast Alaska were as interested in this proposition as the Canadians. The mining operations already located in the area would realize large savings in transportation costs and perhaps be able to boost production. Noyes wanted to know what the British Columbia government wanted to do about the Taku River road. In case there was any possibility of construction toward the lower Taku River or Atlin, he promised to do whatever was possible to extend the road from the American side to the boundary. E.C. Carson, the Minister of Public Works of British Columbia, told Noyes that the provincial Mining Department had been interested in the proposed road for a

considerable period of time in order to help those mining concerns already active in the area. No plans, however, had been made to actually build the road.¹⁹

In the summer of 1949, however, the Canadians had built a road from the Alaska Highway some 55 miles south of Whitehorse, called Jake's Corner, to Atlin. In 1950, the road had not been surfaced and was open for night driving only, with the expectation that surfacing would be performed in the summer. From Atlin a low grade automobile road extended about 25 miles along the foothills in a southerly direction and then curved east and toward the headwaters of the Taku River. The distance from the end of this road to Tulsequah, B.C. amounted to about 60 miles. In the Tulsequah area several mines already operated and other properties and claims in the vicinity stood to profit from a road connection. Norman C. Banfield, a partner in the Juneau law firm of Faulkner, Banfield & Boochever representing the Polaris Taku Mining Company, Ltd. impressed upon the Bureau of Public Roads the beneficial effects such a road would have upon the mining business in the region. A few days later, W.G. Jewitt, the manager of the Tulsequah Chief and the Big Bull properties of the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company of Canada, Limited, told Noyes that the company intended to equip these two properties for production in 1951. He estimated that construction freight would amount to about 10,000 tons, miscellaneous ingoing freight another 4,000 tons per years, and outgoing concentrates consisting of a mixture of copper, lead, and zinc minerals of approximately 35,000-40,000 tons per year. In addition, a community of about 1,000 would have to be supplied. Since transportation consisted only of summer water routes, his company was very interested in the possible construction of a road. Jewitt predicted that, once opened

up, the coast range district would yield many additional mineral discoveries of commercial importance.²⁰

Noyes soon interested Alaska's Governor Ernest Gruening in the Taku River road. The governor knew how little money Congress annually appropriated to the Alaska Road Commission. He felt that Canada should build roads into northern British Columbia across U.S. territory in southeastern Alaska. He suggested that this might involve the exchange of territory, such as the Haines Highway, a major access route between southeastern and interior Alaska which passed through Canadian territory. The problem, it developed, was that the British Columbia provincial government was unable to determine Ottawa's attitude toward such a proposition, and without that knowledge it was unwilling to take any initiative on its own.²¹

By the fall of that year, Noyes had interested various American officials in the possibility of building the Taku River road to the Tulsequah mining district, among them Joseph T. Flakne, Chief of the Alaska Division of the Office of Territories in the Department of the Interior, and B. Frank Heintzleman, Regional Forester of the U.S. Forest Service in Juneau. Noyes had also discussed the proposed project at the September 1950 meeting of the joint Northwest Development Committee of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce at Banff, Alberta, Canada. Subsequently, Noyes, H.A. Stoddart, the Division Engineer of the Bureau of Public Roads in Juneau, and Lieutenant Colonel J.S. Beeman, the Acting Commander of the Northwest Highway System, Canadian Army, Whitehorse, Yukon Territory, had flown from Atlin to Juneau via Tulsequah and the Taku River Valley on September 18, 1950 to scout the route. They pronounced the route practicable, but noted the approximately 20 mile stretch through the difficult canyon of the

Nakina River. This confirmed previous reports. Noyes was certain that the United States would permit Canada to build this road from the mines directly to deep water at the mouth of the Taku River. The same applied to the other river valleys draining northern British Columbia and entering the sea in southeastern Alaska.²²

A month later, in October 1950, the deputy minister of mines for British Columbia declared that the mining situation in the region had changed. The Polaris Taku mine was running out of ore although the property still held some geological promises. Worse yet, gold mining was uneconomical at prevailing prices, and the mine probably should never have reopened after the war. The copper discoveries on the King Salmon River had been disappointing, but asbestos had been discovered in the McDame Creek area during the past summer. Still, the provincial government was uncertain about what, if anything, needed to be done. It either wanted to wait until some big mineral development occurred in the interior of British Columbia and then build, or else open the country by starting a road at the coast and gradually pushing it inward as developments warranted.²³

There matters stood until March 1951 when the Alaska Territorial Legislature addressed a memorial to the President, various agencies in the executive branch, Congress, Alaska's governor, and delegate to Congress. It asked that the federal government take appropriate steps to reach an agreement with the Canadian and British Columbia governments for a program to conduct aerial and ground surveys for a road between Juneau, Alaska and Atlin, B.C. via the Taku River Valley, and between Atlin, B.C. and Hazelton, B.C.; and to arrange for the construction of these two routes. The memorialists summarized the advantages of such roads to both Alaska and British Columbia, and pointed out that building the Hazelton-Jake's Corner

Highway together with its connection to Juneau, Alaska, would open rich agricultural, timber, and mineralized areas, including the Groundhog anthracite coal fields, to development. It also would create a short route of 1,343 miles from Juneau to Seattle, well protected by mountains, and also shorten by 280 miles the distance from West Coast cities to any point in Alaska's interior. Commissioner of Roads Noyes reacted positively to the memorial. He observed that the Alaska Road Commission had long recognized the importance of these roads, and was doing everything possible to secure action by both the American and Canadian governments. He pointed out, however, that the portion of the road within U.S. territory was under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, and not the Alaska Road Commission because it was located within a national forest. He assured the legislators, however, that "everything possible will be done in the future to help these projects along."²⁴

A month later, Noyes, at Governor Gruening's behest, began efforts to arrange a meeting between key American and Canadian officials to discuss the proposed routes and "work out a formula by which a road connecting Atlin, by way of the Taku River Valley, with Juneau" could be built. Such a road would terminate near the mouth of the Taku River from where a car ferry could operate to Juneau. It was difficult to arrange a meeting date suitable for all those who were to participate, but finally it took place at the Vancouver Hotel in Vancouver, B.C. on September 20, 1951. Seven Canadian and six American officials attended. The conferees agreed that the Taku road proposal geographically divided into three parts: the first encompassed the section from Tulsequah to tidewater, of immediate interest to permit transportation of ores and concentrates from the Consolidated mine; the second section involved the stretch to Juneau, the responsibility

of U.S. and Alaska interests who would like to obtain an outlet from southeastern Alaska to the Alaska Highway; the third segment embraced the distance from Tulsequah to Atlin or some other point connected with the continental highway system. Canadian government agencies would be responsible for this portion of the route. Alaska's interests in the Taku River Valley route were slight unless it connected through to the Alaska Highway. Several reconnaissance surveys, mainly by air, had been made of the route. Jerry McKinley, the Chairman of the Road Committee of the Juneau Chamber of Commerce stated that a low-grade but acceptable initial road could be build for about \$5 million for the 45 miles distance from Thane to the international boundary. A.F. Ghiglione, the spokesman for the Alaska Road Commission, stated that if the Canadians could assure that a road would be completed from Tulsequah to Atlin, this would enable U.S. road building agencies to seek and justify authorization of funds to connect such a road with Juneau.²⁵

A representative of Regional Forester B. Frank Heintzleman told the conferees that Canadian government or private interests would be given permission to construct a road from the international boundary down the Taku River to tidewater on the American side as long as it would be open for use as a public highway. A representative of the Bureau of Public Roads declared that, if built to standards, his agency would maintain the road. The conferees agreed that snow would not be a serious problem. E.C. Carson, British Columbia's Minister of Public Works, mentioned that numerous Alaskans had approached him and urged that the Skagway-Carcross route was preferable to the Taku River Valley proposal. The American conferees agreed that the Skagway stretch possessed its own merits, but could not be considered an alternative to the Taku River Valley road since

it could not be connected overland to Juneau and open up little, if any, new country not already served by the Whitepass & Yukon Railway.²⁶

Minister Carson continued that it would be impossible to make any commitments on building the Taku River Valley Road because of the lack of cost figures. He asked whether or not the Canadian federal government would participate in a survey. Dr. W.E. Cofield, a representative of the Department of Mines and Technical Services of the Dominion of Canada was noncommittal, and merely agreed to present the matter to his colleagues. Carson thereupon stated that the provincial Mines Department should take the lead in the proposed project because it would mainly benefit the mining industry. After some more discussion, both sides agreed to obtain funding for surveys on both sides of the international boundary; to keep each other informed on progress in working out such arrangements; and that the effort to seek centralization of surveys was to be headed by the offices of the provincial Minister of Mines and the governor of Alaska.²⁷

A technical problem remained, and that was the prohibition that the provincial government was not permitted to spend funds for road construction outside of its boundaries. And although the Dominion government several years ago had agreed to pay half the cost of the Taku River Valley road, the federal government since that time had rejected requests for similar participation elsewhere. The Canadians anticipated no great problems in building the Tulsequah to tidewater section. In view of the province's many other pressing needs, however, it was unlikely that the provincial government would construct the stretch from Tulsequah to Atlin. This then posed a problem, because the Americans had stated that they would not be interested in building the Juneau to tidewater section unless there was some assurance the road would ultimately connect through to Atlin or

some other point on the main highway system. In the end, the conferees did not agree on any particular joint program, but instead consented to pursue the project, get surveys underway, and exchange information on progress made.²⁸ In short, the conferees parted from each other in friendship, but knew that the Taku River Valley road was as far in the future as it had been before the meeting.

At the end of March 1952 Governor Gruening reminded Byron Johnson, the Premier of the Province of British Columbia of the September 1951 Vancouver meeting on the proposed road. The American agencies were willing to undertake a location survey if the provincial authorities would do the same for their portion of the route. He suggested that perhaps another meeting might be useful. The premier's office declared that this would serve no purpose since no funds for such a survey were available, and the Dominion government was not interested in the project. At the instruction of the American State Department, Frederick W. Hinke, the U.S. Consul at Vancouver, talked with provincial officials about the proposed project--with the same results. He was given aerial photographs which gave a vivid impression of the extremely difficult terrain which would be encountered in road construction through the Taku River Valley. Above all else, provincial road building requirements were so pressing in thickly populated areas and money in such short supply that the government simply could not afford to build secondary roads to open up remote areas. The province also had a shortage of location engineers. Provincial Chief Engineer N.M. McCallum had stressed the fact that "the older generation who had surveyed the railways of the Province had largely died out and that younger men were inexperienced and were not willing to go into the bush." McCallum also doubted that it was possible to build a 2,000 foot wooden trestle across

the Taku Glacier in order to connect Tulsequah with Juneau.²⁹ In short, the Canadians were unwilling, and financially unable, to move on the project.

Others, however, were unwilling to give up the project. The Associated Boards of Trade of Central British Columbia passed two resolutions at its August 19-21 convention in Smithers, B.C. It endorsed the project and urged Canadian and American officials "to discuss and agree upon the standards of the survey, the standards of the road, and to conduct the survey thereof during the summer season of 1953." The second resolution pointed out that "roads constituting a part of said route have already been constructed between Telegraph Creek and Dease Lake, and between McDame Creek and the Alaska Highway." To complete the project would only require road and bridge construction in southeastern Alaska from Wrangell and Petersburg to the Canadian border. This work, therefore, should be carried out by the responsible American agencies. Canadian authorities, the Associated Boards of Trade urged, should build from the boundary to Telegraph Creek, and from Dease Lake to McDame Creek. In early summer, Juneau lawyer Norman C. Banfield told his client, the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company, Ltd., of Train, B.C. that the Interior Department appropriation bill in Congress originally had included \$250,000 for surveys, one of which was for a reconnaissance between Juneau and the Canadian boundary on the Taku River. The House of Representatives, however, had deleted the item, but the Senate had reinstated it. It looked as if the House would concur with the Senate amendment. "If and when this appropriation is made," Banfield continued, "the Alaska Road Commission intends to make a thorough reconnaissance of the area between Juneau and the Canadian border." It also planned to make an aerial survey of the Canadian leg of

the route. Furthermore, the Bureau of Public Roads had promised the territorial government to survey the Alaskan section of this route as soon as a Canadian government agency agreed to continue the survey from the border to Atlin.³⁰ In short, the Canadians now had to take the initiative.

The provincial government, informed of the American plans, reiterated its position. No funds had been set aside for such a survey, and although it was interested in improving the transportation facilities in the Taku River Valley "at some time," it had "given up thought of a through road." In September, the Bureau of Public Roads reported that it had studied the Alaska Road Commission files on the project. Construction of a road from Juneau to the Canadian border in the Taku River Valley and on to Atlin, B.C. had been discussed for years. Locations on both sides of the Taku River had been proposed, but because of the continued advance of the Taku Glacier, construction on the north side of the river had to be eliminated as impracticable. The south side location seemed to be ideal. The proposed Bureau of Public Roads location would cross Taku Inlet at Taku Point, follow the south side of the river to Canyon Island, cross to the north side and follow it to the Canadian border. Still following the north bank of the Taku River, it would go to the confluence of the Sloko and Nakina Rivers; thence up the Nakina and Silver Salmon Rivers to the summit near O'Donnell Lake at an elevation of about 2,500 feet; and from the summit it would connect with the existing road extending approximately 30 miles south from Atlin. The cost for the Alaska section, according to a 1951 Bureau of Public Roads estimate, came to \$10,250,000, while the 92 mile Canadian section from the boundary to Atlin would cost about \$6,440,000. The Bureau of Public Roads warned, however, that, since the proposed location had not been viewed on the ground, the cost estimates

might not be realistic. The agency nonetheless believed that its assessment of slightly over \$213,000 per mile for the 48 miles of new construction from Juneau to the Canadian border might be reduced considerably.³¹

On October 1, 1953, W.J. Niemi, the Chief Engineer of the Alaska Road Commission authorized \$25,000 for a pioneer survey of the Juneau-Canadian border section of the proposed southeast Alaska highway via the Taku River Valley. Early in 1954, A.F. Ghiglione reported that the Alaska Road Commission had obtained funding from Congress to initiate surveys on various routes, namely the Skagway-Carcross, Juneau-Taku-Atlin, Stikine and Unuk Rivers. Work was to start in the 1954 season. The Alaska Road Commission also tried to reawaken the interest of British Columbian officials in the projects. There was one new development--and that was the proposal of Frobisher Limited, together with associated companies, to undertake a large scale hydro-electric development involving the diversion of water into the Taku River drainage and the provision of an outlet to the sea down the Taku Valley.³²

The Alaska Road Commission spent about \$30,000 on a survey of the Taku route from Thane to Yehring Creek, about 10 miles south of the Canadian border on the Taku River. On March 9, 1957, the Bureau of Public Roads, which had absorbed the Alaska Road Commission in September 1956, terminated the work and withdrew the remaining funds for transfer to other projects.³³ The Juneau-Taku Valley-Atlin road was never built. A number of factors were responsible. The provincial government of British Columbia was unwilling to spend millions of dollars to benefit a few mining operations in the northern part of the province. The Alaska Road Commission and the Bureau of Public Roads spent considerable amounts for surveys, but were

unwilling to recommend that Congress appropriate money for construction without firm Canadian assurances that the road be continued to Atlin and the Alaska Highway, thus providing Juneau with an outlet to the primary road system in British Columbia and the Yukon. All that remains of these considerable efforts are the bulky and extensive American survey documents.

FOOTNOTES

1. F.E. Baxter to Chr. F. Wyller, July 17, 1957, Bureau of Public Roads, box 65413, R.G. 30, Federal Records Center, Seattle, Washington.
2. Third Meeting, "Select Committee To Enquire Into Conduct and Management Of The Gauvreau Expedition, '92," Third Meeting, February 21, 1894, Bureau of Public Roads, box 65413, R.G. 30, Federal Records Center, Seattle, Washington.
3. Ibid.
4. Captain Wm. Moore to Honorable Richard McBride, November 22, 1902, Bureau of Public Roads, box 65413, R.G. 30, Federal Records Center, Seattle, Washington.
5. Secretary, Department of the Interior, Ottawa, Canada, to Moore, December 29, 1902, Moore to Secretary, Department of the Interior, Ottawa, Canada, January 15, 1903, Bureau of Public Roads, box 65413, R.G. 30, Federal Records Center, Seattle, Washington.
6. R.J. Shepard to Alaska Road Commission, October 31, 1921, Bureau of Public Roads, box 65413, R.G. 30, Federal Records Center, Seattle, Washington.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid.

9. Ibid.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid.
12. Ibid.
13. John C. Gotwals to C.H. Flory, May 2, 1922, Flory to Gotwals, May 15, 1922, District Engineer, Department of Public Works, the Government of the Province of British Columbia to Alaska Road Commission, January 20, 1930, C.L. Monroe, Gold Commissioner, to Alaska Road Commission, February 24, 1930, J.G. Christiansen to C.L. Monroe, March 12, 1930, Frank W. Shutko, Captain, Corps of Engineers, Operations Officer, to J.G. Christiansen, Secretary, Alaska Road Commission, April 8, 1943, "Aerial Reconnaissance on the Atlin Lake-Taku River Truck Trail," by H.A. Stoddart and J.B. Reher, May 16, 1942, Bureau of Public Roads, box 65413, R.G. 30, Federal Records Center, Seattle, Washington.
14. Ibid.
- ~~15. W.P. Dunbar, "Taku River Road," Report on reconnaissance for road from tidal water at Swede Point on Taku Inlet to connect with the existing road between Polaris-Taku mine and their Taku River landing, for the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company of Canada, Limited; John F. Walker, Deputy Minister of Mines, to the Honorable R.C. MacDonald, Minister of Mines, June 2, 1948, Bureau of Public Roads, box 65413, R.G. 30, Federal Records Center, Seattle, Washington.~~
16. "Memorandum Re: Taku River Road," John F. Walker to R.C. MacDonald, June 2, 1948, John F. Walker to the Honorable E.C. Carson, Minister of Public Works, March 31, 1950, Bureau of Public Roads, box 65413, R.G. 30, Federal Records Center, Seattle, Washington.

17. Associated Boards of Trade of Central British Columbia and affiliated Chambers of Commerce of South-eastern Alaska, "Hazelton-Whitehorse Highway Project," Resolution No. 11, September, 1948, Bureau of Public Roads, box 65413, R.G. 30, Federal Records Center, Seattle, Washington.
18. John R. Noyes, Memorandum for File, "Map Location of a Road from Taku Inlet to a Connection with the Alaska Highway," March 25, 1949, John R. Noyes, Memorandum for File, "Reconnaissance of the Lower Taku River," August 31, 1949, Bureau of Public Roads, box 65413, R.G. 30, Federal Records Center, Seattle, Washington.
19. Noyes to the Honorable E.C. Carson, Minister of Public Works, Province of British Columbia, March 22, 1950, E.C. Carson to Noyes, April 20, 1950, Bureau of Public Roads, box 65413, R.G. 30, Federal Records Center, Seattle, Washington.
20. N.C. Banfield to Division Engineer, April 24, 1950, W.G. Jewitt to Colonel John R. Noyes, May 3, 1950, Bureau of Public Roads, box 65413, R.G. 30, Federal Records Center, Seattle, Washington.
21. Noyes to Hon. E.C. Carson, May 23, 1950, John F. Walker to W.B. Milner, May 26, 1950, Bureau of Public Roads, box 65413, R.G. 30, Federal Records Center, Seattle, Washington.
22. Noyes to Hon. E.C. Carson, September 27, 1950, Bureau of Public Roads, box 65413, R.G. 30, Federal Records Center, Seattle, Washington.
23. John F. Walker to Hon. E.C. Carson, October 7, 1950, Bureau of Public Roads, box 65413, R.G. 30, Federal Records Center, Seattle, Washington.
24. Lew M. Williams, Secretary of Alaska, to Alaska Road Commission, March 8, 1951, House Memorial No. 34, 20th Territorial Legislature, March 6,

1951, Noyes to Williams, April 6, 1951, Bureau of Public Roads, box 65413, R.G. 30, Federal Records Center, Seattle, Washington.

25. Noyes to Carson, May 29, 1951, A.F. Ghiglione to B. Frank Heintzleman, May 31, 1951, A.F. Ghiglione to Jos. T. Flakne, May 31, 1951, A.F. Ghiglione to Hugh A. Stoddart, May 31, 1951, A.F. Ghiglione to Hon. E.C. Carson, June 20, 1951, George Sundborg, General Manager, Alaska Development Board, Juneau, Alaska, Memo for the Record, September 21, 1951. Those attending the meeting were:

R.C. MacDonald, Minister of Mines, B.C.;

E.C. Carson, Minister of Public Works, B.C.;

Dr. W.E. Cofield, Department of Mines and Technical Services, Dominion of Canada;

W.G. Jewitt, Manager of Mines, Consolidated Smelting and Refining Company, Trail, B.C.;

W.B. Milner, President, Transcontinental Resources (a mining and property concern), Vancouver, B.C.;

Joseph T. Flakne, Director, Alaska Division, Office of Territories, Department of Interior;

A.F. Ghiglione, Commissioner, Alaska Road Commission;

Frank A. Metcalf, Territorial Highway Engineer;

George Sundborg, General Manager, Alaska Development Board (also representing Governor Ernest Gruening);

Herb Rowland, President, Juneau Chamber of Commerce;

Jerry McKinley, Chairman, Road Committee, Juneau Chamber of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads, box 65413, R.G. 30, Federal Records Center, Seattle, Washington.

26. George Sundborg, Memo for the Record, September 21, 1951, Bureau of Public Roads, box 65413, R.G. 30, Federal Records Center, Seattle, Washington.
27. Ibid.
28. Ibid.
29. Gruening to Premier Byron Johnson, March 27, 1952, N.M. McCallum, Chief Engineer, to Governor Gruening, April 29, 1952, Frederick W. Hinke to Department of State, May 5, 1952, Bureau of Public Roads, box 65413, R.G. 30, Federal Records Center, Seattle, Washington.
30. The Associated Boards of Trade of Central British Columbia to the Alaska Road Commission, September 29, 1952, The Associated Boards of Trade of Central British Columbia to the Alaska Road Commission, September 30, 1952, Norman C. Banfield to the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company, Ltd., June 24, 1953, Bureau of Public Roads, box 65413, R.G. 30, Federal Records Center, Seattle, Washington.
31. W.G. Jewitt to Norman C. Banfield, July 28, 1953, George R. Russell, Chief, Survey Section, to Harold B. Schultz, Chief, Engineering Division, September 8, 1953, Bureau of Public Roads, box 65413, R.G. 30, Federal Records Center, Seattle, Washington.
32. 1953 Work Order No. 539, October 1, 1953, Alaska Road Commission, A.F. Ghiglione to W.G. Jewitt, January 5, 1954, W.G. Jewitt to A.F. Ghiglione, January 22, 1954, Bureau of Public Roads, box 65413, R.G. 30, Federal Records Center, Seattle, Washington.
33. Supplement No. 1, 1956 Work Order No. 92, authorized March 9, 1957, Bureau of Public Roads, F.E. Baxter, Supervising Highway Design Engineer, to Chr. F. Wyller, District Engineer, Bureau of Public Roads, July 1, 1957, Bureau of Public Roads, box 65413, R.G. 30, Federal Records Center, Seattle, Washington.

FITTING ALASKA INTO THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY SYSTEM

At the end of 1956, the Territorial Highway Patrol lobbied legislators to divert driver's license revenues from the office of the Territorial Highway Engineer to its own accounts in order to help meet the costs of highway safety patrols. The question immediately arose if such action would result in a reduction of Alaska's apportionment of federal aid funds. The Bureau pointed out that it had interpreted Section 12 of the Hayden-Cartwright Act of June 18, 1934 as permitting the use of highway user tax proceeds for meeting such expenses. Any police functions not directly related to highway operations, however, were excluded. Furthermore, any proceeds from highway user taxes and fees not in force on June 18, 1934, the date on which the Hayden-Cartwright measure became law, were not subject to its provisions. And since the territorial government had not yet imposed driver license fees at that date, such funds were excluded from the application of the statute. A related question dealt with the propriety of using federal aid funds for the operation of truck weighing scales. In the past, the Alaska Road Commission had used federal monies for the construction and partial operation of such scales until the General Accounting Office objected to the practice. The Territorial Highway Patrol then assumed responsibility, but now wanted to remove that cost item from its budget and turn the function over to the BPR. Bureau officials determined that this called for an official opinion from the GAO, and advised the regional engineer that it was inadvisable to use federal aid funds and that the BPR should not become involved in highway enforcement activities in Alaska.¹

Over the years the Bureau had developed a standardized set of forms which enabled it to keep track of federal aid projects in the various states. Unhappily, these did not fit in Alaska where these projects were financed on an entirely different basis from the customary matching in the states. Therefore, Regional Engineer Swick requested authority for Region 10 to use a special project agreement instead of the prescribed form and a memorandum notice to the territory for obligating funds. The Bureau's general counsel had helped Swick draft the forms, and recommended that the commissioner approve their use in the territory since that would "help provide a uniform basis of fiscal documentation without complicating our normal accounting procedures." Unfortunately, the territorial highway board had shown but little interest in actively participating in program development. Once it did, its active part in programming would indicate automatic approval to proceed with construction. The Bureau, therefore, decided that nothing would be gained by the additional paper work required in writing such a letter to the territory.²

It soon became apparent that the Bureau's Washington office and Region 10 could not agree on final figures for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957. The latter showed that \$13,342,898 had been available in 1956-1957, while the former showed a total of \$14,580,793. Obviously, reconciling these differing figures required major paper work.³

While budget officers tried to arrive at one set of figures, Arthur Siegel and Gordon Gronberg, the Bureau chiefs of the liaison division and the costs section, met in Juneau with territorial officials to work out the final details of a broad highway program of development, improvement, and maintenance for the next several years. The two Bureau officials announced that F.C. Turner, the administrator of the Federal Highway Administration

had approved the Alaska Highway system as submitted by the Region 10 office. It included 1,959.1 miles of primary and 3,077.6 miles of secondary roads. The latter were divided into 2,062.7 miles of class A, and 1,014.9 miles of class B roads. The 1957-1958 program was set at \$21,459,000, which included \$18,599,000 of federal aid and matching funds and \$2,160,000 in forest highway funds for the Tongass National Forest. The Bureau also tentatively authorized the use of federal aid funds for the establishment of a southeast Alaska ferry system to link coastal and island cities from Skagway to Ketchikan. Bureau officials and the Region 10 engineer also decided to use the territorial 10 percent matching funds entirely for maintenance of the secondary road system.⁴

For two weeks in early July 1957 three representatives of the Bureau's Washington Maintenance and Construction Administration Branches toured Alaska together with Region 10 Engineer Swick and his assistant, William J. Niemi. The purpose of the trip had been to consider maintenance and construction problems, but they observed and discussed many other phases of Region 10 activities. They inspected the roads, visited the offices, shops, and camps, and held lengthy discussions with BPR field personnel and others. The men inspected most of the primary and some of the secondary highway system, including those on the Seward Peninsula, and also toured most of the forest highways in the vicinity of Juneau. They did not see the Denali Highway, the stretch of the Richardson Highway between Denali and Gakona, the Haines Cutoff, the Copper River Highway and most of the forest highways in the southeast outside of Juneau. The officials learned much from their inspection trip. They noted the lack of shoulders on the main highways, and were told that these were originally designed to have a 20-foot bituminous surface with a 2-foot shoulder on each side. Paving,

however, was placed over the entire 24-foot width, leaving no shoulders. They recommended that a minimum of 4 feet shoulders be added to existing primary highways and should be included in all future construction. Since most highways had been paved fairly recently they were still in good shape. In numerous places, however, serious settlement and waves had developed over permafrost areas. District engineers explained that ground settlement did not always happen the first year after construction, but gradually became worse during succeeding summers until the frost reached a new level. The worst conditions prevailed where the paving was placed over a road which had little or no base. This had happened frequently during the early resurfacing program. Later paving with plant mix on good bases and roadbeds showed few settlement problems. They learned that Region 10 used three asphalt grades, namely MC-0 for primes, MC-3 for seals, and an RC-3 for plant mixes. Contractors usually put a chip seal on plant mix surfaces shortly after construction in order to provide better visibility and skid-resistance.⁵

Much of the work performed on gravel surfaced roads and highways had to be classified as improvements rather than maintenance. These routes were largely located in thickly populated regions and had been built to provide access for mining operations or open lands for homesteading or recreational purposes. In interior Alaska, most of the ground consisted of silt. Very little clay or other natural binder was available. Gravel was found in river valleys where gold dredges had worked and washed the material. The Alaska Road Commission possessed no crushing or screening equipment. As a result, it built roadbeds consisting mostly of silt "covered with pitrun gravel with considerable oversize and little or no binder." To make things even more difficult, permafrost was found only a few inches

under the natural ground surface over much of the region. Bituminous treatment or surfacing of some kind was desirable to preserve the roadbed and gravel and keep down the choking dust in the summer, but was unlikely given limited funds and the mileages of primary highways in need of reconstruction and those still to be built. As a result, maintenance of the gravel roads was neglected during the summer, but they were bladed and shaped in the spring and fall.⁶

The visitors found that side ditches appeared to be adequately maintained, although in some areas sags in the ditch line held water. In many instances crosspipes were badly bowed under fill and entrapped water often saturated the road foundation. Many of these pipes were located on the Richardson Highway between Fairbanks and Big Delta, and on the Alaska Highway between Big Delta and Tok Junction. On both sections there had been little reconstruction before paving. In many areas the roadsides were unesthetic because of the general practice of merely pushing the clearing and grubbing debris into the trees or into a windrow along the outer edges of the cleared areas. Burning the material was difficult, but there was no reason why the unsightly piles could not be leveled off and made more presentable at little additional cost.⁷

Region 10 had embarked on a bridge replacement program. John L. Palmer, from the headquarters Maintenance Branch, found the design to be adequate except that the timber wingwalls were too short to hold shoulder materials. Practically everywhere high waters had washed out the shoulders at the bridge ends causing hazardous traffic conditions. Palmer noted that adequate warning and informational signs were in place on the principal highways. Most of the signs conformed to national standards, although there were a few minor variations. For example, one railroad crossing was

protected by STOP signs. Pavement markings on rural sections of paved roads were limited to the more heavily travelled portions near municipalities and usually did not extend more than 30 to 50 miles from the larger cities. Alaska used a white, broken center and yellow barrier lines, but the strips were not reflectorized. Few guardrails had been installed in the past, primarily because the former Alaska Road Commission had objected that these made winter maintenance more difficult. Recently, however, the Bureau had acquired a supply of beam-type guardrails which were to be put into place in the near future.⁸

Palmer looked at the equipment and concluded that most of it was too large and cumbersome for ordinary maintenance work and was also worn out. The Alaska Road Commission had done much of the construction work in Alaska which necessitated the acquisition of heavy equipment. Most of it the ARC had obtained from military surpluses, and it had been in poor shape when received. Replacement had been difficult because of financial constraints. The ARC had never been able to buy a new rotary plow, and maintaining equipment had been expensive. For example, three tractors each costing \$19,000 new were overhauled at a cost of \$15,000 each. They should have been scrapped. He recommended that the Bureau begin a systematic replacement program with the goal of acquiring standardized suitable equipment for maintenance operations. Additional machinery was urgently needed for maintaining bituminous pavements and markings, signs, guardrails, and roadsides. Palmer also visited a number of shops and storage yards. Some were new and had been built from plans prepared by the former ARC. The new shop buildings varied in size, but all were timber-framed and sheathed in metal. He praised the layout and buildings at the Soldotna depot on the Sterling Highway as exceptional. The shop,

100 ft. x 89 ft. was located in a large, fenced yard, and outside the enclosure near the bank of the Kenai River was a 32 ft. x 48 ft. modern residence for the foreman and his family. The Bureau planned to gradually replace older shop buildings with this new design, thereby greatly facilitating equipment repair and service, particularly for the difficult winter maintenance operations.⁹

Palmer proposed a plan for reporting maintenance operations, but noted that since all of these functions were under the immediate control of the BPR, this constituted a self-appraisal. He suggested that the regional engineer submit an annual report covering all maintenance activities. This was to include the mileage and types of roads maintained by the Bureau and the cities during the summers, and the routes and mileages kept open during the winters. The annual report should also note the type and amount of work performed on a reimbursable basis; maintenance problems encountered; Bureau expenditures for summer and winter maintenance; major equipment purchases and inventory; shops or other buildings constructed or being built and a brief discussion of the adequacy of all maintenance operations.¹⁰

Palmer stated that the maintenance cost accounts developed by the Bureau headquarters were too broad and did not cover all necessary work items in Alaska, which included ditch cleaning and reshaping, shoulder and roadside maintenance, erosion control and the resealing of bituminous surfaces. He recommended that the regional office establish new accounts to fit these needs. Finally, Region 10 desperately needed legal advice for obtaining rights-of-way and for clarifying a host of legal questions which had arisen with Alaska's inclusion in the FAHA of 1956 and the transition from the ARC to the BPR.¹¹

John H. Wall was from the Construction Administration Branch, and his observations supplemented those made by his colleague, Palmer. The paved highways varied considerably in width and condition. Most pavement consisted of plant mix, and only a little of penetration, generally a 1.5 inch mat, and varied in width from 20 to 26 feet. Much of the new surfacing was laid over existing pavement, while some had been applied to newly prepared bases. Wall noted that contractors used corrective measures in subsidence and other fault spots before paving. Conversations with contractors convinced him that it was impossible to accurately anticipate such fault areas, especially where permafrost existed, as an apparently stable area might fault one year and tighten up the next. Slippage of poor and unstable side hill cut areas had also contributed to road movement and subsidence.¹²

Contractors generally used a dense bituminous mix which build a tight pavement. Wall traveled over several roads which had been paved in the last couple of years and left unsealed. They showed little, if any, raveling and very minor moisture penetration. He thought that leaving the road to cure for a year or two permitted corrective measures to be taken before sealing. When the chips were finally applied it resulted in a practically new roadway with less likelihood of pavement failure. In short, contractors had worked out a sound construction procedure. Like his colleague Palmer, Wall urged that shoulders be built on all future construction projects despite the added costs.¹³

The gravel roads inspected showed a continuing loss of road integrity because no surface stabilization had been applied. Consequently, the fine material worked itself to the bottom or the wind blew it away, and the course and large stones surfaced. This caused insecure traction and made

traveling slow. And although Wall recognized that outlying communities desired a usable roadway, he advised against building them too far in advance of paving operations unless some retentive surfacing was applied to protect the base material.¹⁴

Like his colleague, Wall urged the speedy installation of guard rails and striping of the paved highways. Drainage was particularly serious in Alaska because of the rapid run off. Because of the many unstable areas of fills and subsurface support, he urged that drainage should be carried across the roadway as quickly as possible and not be carried longitudinally at any great lengths. This entailed higher costs for additional culverts but was well worth the price in protecting the roadbed. The ditching and back slope areas appeared to be irregular, some of it caused by slides and weather sloughing, but he thought that some of this deterioration could be avoided by back slope stabilization measures.¹⁵

Until the Bureau headquarters had become more familiar with Alaska construction operations, procedures, and customs, he advised that Washington be furnished copies of all construction inspection reports. These inspections were to be made by the district, and not the resident engineer. During the course of his travel, Wall discussed many topics, including right-of-way costs. Before the Bureau took over, owners had furnished right-of-way free of charge to the ARC. After 1956, many private property owners had begun to demand payment. Thereupon, the Bureau had made it policy to pay in all instances. That had required additional funds to cover property evaluations and purchase. Snow and ice removal presented a major problem in most areas of Alaska, and heavier equipment for this task was needed in some areas. In addition there was insufficient abutment wingwall construction on many of the bridges which resulted in the scouring

and deterioration of approaches and fill slopes. Wall recommended a general program of riprapping abutment fill slopes and culvert inlets and outlets which would result in installation protection. Most bridges also lacked cover plates between the bridge floor and approach slab. The void between was usually filled with bituminous material which often had slipped out and exposed the opening. In retrospect, the three Bureau officials considered their trip to have been invaluable. They gained a wealth of information that would be very helpful to all Washington headquarters personnel concerned with Alaska activities. They had been very favorably impressed with Region 10 personnel, particularly with regional engineer Swick's detailed knowledge and understanding of Alaska's situation and problems which he had gained in but a few weeks on the job there.¹⁶

While the three officials visited the north, uncertainty persisted at Washington headquarters about the specific Alaska responsibilities of the various Bureau branches. A staff meeting in the Commissioner's office on July 31 decided the division of responsibilities after a vigorous discussion. Accordingly, the Engineering Branch was to administer systems and programs, while the Operations Branch was to be responsible for all actions involving federal aid projects beyond the program stage. This included construction as well as maintenance on all Alaska highways included in the federal aid system. Operations also was to administer the remaining carry-over claims on work formerly performed by the ARC, and continue its responsibilities for all work financed with Forest Highway or other federal funds separate and distinct from federal aid monies.¹⁷

Several other decisions were made at the staff meeting. M.B. Christensen was convinced that Swick needed assistance in handling the detailed paper work required for the various phases of federal aid highway

projects. Swick was the only one with any previous federal aid work experience in Alaska, and except for those connected with Chris F. Wyller's Juneau district office, there also was no one with any experience with forest highway work. As a result, Swick had to devote much of his time to procedural details which normally were handled at a lower level. Christensen was convinced that existing federal aid work procedures did not fit very well into prevailing Alaskan conditions. Washington had practically given no written instructions on how to handle some of the operations that did not fit federal aid procedures applicable elsewhere to Region 10. In frustration Christensen observed that "all of the other Federal-aid procedures are based on the principle that there is a State highway department that takes the initiative and performs the original functions" in all phases of the work. Alaska, however, had no effective territorial highway department and the members of the territorial highway board had hardly taken an active part in federal aid activities "and have exhibited little desire or intent to do so." Therefore, the Bureau had to initiate practically all actions and in most cases complete them as well with no territorial participation. Swick quickly needed written instructions covering the detailed procedures to be followed for all phases of the work from systems to the construction stage. Furthermore, these instructions needed to be so clear and simple that Swick could turn them over to staff members with the expectation that they would be able to take care of the paper work on their own. Swick only needed to approve the final document. Christensen also proposed to have an Alaska staff member "come to the States to serve a period of indoctrination" in one of the division offices dealing with both federal aid and forest highway work.¹⁸

Accordingly, Washington issued the first of several guidelines for inspection reports on federal aid construction projects. In the contiguous states, the Bureau required only initial and final reports, while on secondary roads only the final one was required. Projects built under direct Bureau supervision, however, required monthly reports with a copy submitted to Washington. The Bureau directly supervised forest highway and federal aid projects in Alaska, and therefore it was necessary that the procedures for the two classes of projects be the same. Thus far, monthly inspections and reports had not been made for federal aid projects, and probably not always for forest highway projects. Each district engineer, however, submitted a monthly "Situation Report" to the regional office discussing the status and problems of all activities in his district, including construction, surveys, design, right-of-way, maintenance and administration. Washington considered these "Situation Reports" evidence of adequate inspection performance, and instructed Swick to submit an initial and final inspection report roughly following prescribed guidelines for each federal aid project. The regional engineer also offered to submit a monthly "Situation Report" as well as others of special inspections made by representatives of his office. Together, these reports furnished enough information on Alaska construction projects for headquarter use.¹⁹

An incident in a bid award in Alaska prompted instruction on bid guarantees for federal aid projects in the north. A low bid on a federal aid project was not accompanied by a bid guaranty. A statement accompanying the document made it clear that a bonding company in Seattle furnished the bid bond. The bid was read and the bonding company wired Region 10 a few hours after the bids had been opened that it had executed and mailed the bond. Washington learned of the incident and informed Region 10 that

since the bid had been opened and read publicly, General Accounting Office rules required that the technicality of lack of a bid bond be waved and the award be made to the low bidder. Region 10 followed these instructions, but the action aroused considerable protest from contractors, the offices of the Associated General Contractors, and employees of Region 10 who all claimed that this was contrary to policies followed by the Alaska Road Commission. Since that incident, Washington had issued a directive covering both federal aid and forest highway construction which included a provision following ARC practices, namely when a bid was opened and found not to be accompanied by the required bid guaranty, it was not to be read nor considered.²⁰

During its existence, the ARC had performed much of its work by force account, that is, with its own crews, rather than bidding projects. In the summer of 1957, a General Counsel's Office ruling upheld that practice in an opinion that held that Sect. 17a of the FAHA of 1954, requiring affirmative findings of public interest to justify construction by other than the competitive bidding contract method did not apply to federal aid construction in Alaska under Bureau supervision. That section also required that reports be rendered to the Public Works Committee of both Houses of Congress regarding such affirmative findings. Regulations nearly completed also covered the construction phase of federal aid work in Alaska. It included a statement that Sect. 17a was not applicable. The regulations did, however, include a provision that findings of public interest should be made to justify departure from the contract method of construction. Swick pointed out that frequently other federal agencies, the territory, cities and private individuals asked the Bureau to perform minor construction on a reimbursable basis. The work was not suitable for contract

awards because it was of short duration on isolated sections of road. The Bureau urged that Swick fully document the necessity of performing the work by force account, and he agreed that a general finding covering several or all projects of this class would be desirable.²¹

During his July Alaska trip, Christensen had learned that Swick was trying to develop an appropriate formula for equitably distributing federal aid funds among the four judicial districts, and to obtain the active participation of the territorial highway board in program development. On July 15, Swick handed out a tentative distribution formula for 1959 federal aid highway funds to the territorial board members. Swick emphasized that none of the factors or other figures were final, but only provided a basis for discussion. He invited board members to ask questions, make suggestions for revision of the factors and projects, or propose alternate bases for distribution of funds or other projects to be substituted for those listed. Board members asked practically no questions, nor advanced any comments or recommendations. They did ask a few questions regarding the specific locations and types of work to be included in the list of proposed projects. Swick was uncertain whether or not the board's response was due to general approval of the proposals, a failure to understand them, passive acceptance or a lack of interest in the subject. In any event, he exhorted the board members to seriously consider programming and be prepared to work out the final 1959 fiscal year program with Bureau representatives at the October meeting.²²

Specifically, Swick had used a number of factors affecting the allocation of funds to the judicial districts, namely area, primary, secondary aid total mileages, rural and urban populations, vehicle registration, gasoline receipts, and preliminary needs analysis. The last line of the

tabulation gave the weighted selected factors for Alaska with equal weights given to those individual factors indicated by asteriks, namely area, total mileage, rural and urban populations, vehicle registration, gasoline receipts and preliminary needs analysis. Accordingly, the first division received 14 percent of the 1959 federal aid highway funds, the second 8 percent, the third 49 percent and the fourth 29 percent.²³

Swick estimated 1959 funds at \$17,355,927, some \$8,843,591 for primary, \$5,963,607 for secondary, and \$73,729 for urban roads, and another \$2,475,000 for forest highways. Approximately \$4,633,637 of the total were tied up in fixed charges, such as maintenance, building replacement and repair and planning, and another \$1,220,000 in reserves, leaving about \$11,000,000 for new construction projects. Based on the selected factors, the first division was to receive \$2,200,000 or 20 percent of the total, the second \$700,000 or 7 percent, the third \$5,300,000 or 48 percent, and the fourth \$2,800,000 or 25 percent. Swick finally listed a number of projects in each district which either had to be built with 1959 monies or were exceptionally worthy to be considered for funding. In preparing the list, he had not matched the costs of the listed projects against the available monies, except for the second division. As a result, the project listing overprogrammed available funds in some instances and underprogrammed them in others.²⁴

Planning survey activities concerned Swick as well. He informed Washington that he had deferred most such activities hoping to hire a qualified individual to direct the work in Alaska. In the meantime, however, he had continued the modest traffic counting program of the Alaska Road Commission as a maintenance activity, as well as two research projects financed from Interior funds, now depleted. He had employed one man for

the remaining six summer weeks to make traffic classification counts, assemble the field information and perform a limited analysis at a cost of \$3,000. He intended to have analyzed a sample of Alaska's motor vehicle registration records and perhaps also scale weight data collected by the territorial police.²⁵

Swick had continued two research projects funded through the 1.5 percent planning component in the annual maintenance charges. One of these involved a permafrost project at the Glennallen depot which had been underway for several years under the general supervision of the Geological Survey. The Bureau contributed men and equipment, installed and read a group of thermistors, passive electrical resistors, and performed some of the analysis. The project had cost about \$12,000 per year. The second project was an avalanche study in the Girdwood area south of Anchorage which had yielded gratifying results in predicting slide conditions and designing protective barriers. Previous annual costs had approximated \$7,00, including the salary and expenses of an avalanche expert and his assistant during the winter months. The total program cost about \$23,000, and Swick intended to use the remainder of the 1957 one and one-half percent monies or \$31,886 to purchase additional portable traffic recording equipment as soon as the usefulness of the instruments passed down from the ARC and the old Public Roads Districts had been ascertained. Swick estimated that he would have to spend about \$2,000 on new purchases. As of August 31, the Bureau had authorized \$31,886 for these research undertakings. There were no territorial contributions. The projects were to be financed by the 1.5 percent planning component in the annual maintenance charges plus additional federal funds to equal the territorial share. The authorized expenditure of \$31,886, however, did not include a proposed

southeastern ferry study for operations between Prince Rupert, B.C., Canada, Ketchikan, Wrangell, Petersburg, Juneau, and Haines, Alaska.²⁶

In the middle of September, Swick asked his district engineers to make detailed recommendations for putting together the 1958 Alaska federal aid program. He intended to use these at the October meeting of the territorial highway board in order to arrive at a mutually agreeable agenda for 1958. He also told them that the farm roads programmed for 1957 should be completed within authorized funds, but not to include any new projects because now the territory had to assume responsibilities in this area. He then asked his district engineers to list projects in order of priority; recommend lists of new projects in order of priority; recommend new roads and reconstruction of the existing system; comment on the adequacy of maintenance funds, and carefully consider the breakdown between summer and winter maintenance in order to derive the maximum benefit from these expenditures; list, in order of priority, the replacement of existing inadequate maintenance facilities; and program for completion centerline and barrier striping; provide for the installation of adequate alignment and speed signs and guard rail installation; and make certain that planning keep ahead of future programs by scheduling the necessary field surveys. Within a couple of weeks, the district engineers complied and submitted their detailed recommendations. At about the same time, G.M. Williams, the assistant commissioner for engineering at Bureau headquarters sent Swick a copy of a confidential report prepared by the Commanding General, U.S. Army, Alaska, and supported by the Navy and Air Force which dealt with the importance of the territory's highway system to present and future military requirements. It appeared that the designation of the federal aid primary and secondary systems meshed well with military requirements. The Bureau

advised the Department of Defense to lobby for a direct route from Anchorage to Fairbanks because from a logistical point of view it made much sense, and also it would save distance and travel time. Most importantly, the military installations in both Anchorage and Fairbanks generated much of the highway traffic between these two points.²⁷

Several other issues occupied Swick's attention in the late fall of 1957. Washington instructed Region 10 to assume maintenance responsibilities of the federal aid systems in the territory's various towns and cities. Swick was to draw up agreements with Alaska's incorporated entities specifying the manner in which maintenance was to be accomplished. In some instance, Swick was to use the Bureau's own equipment and workforce, while in others the cities were to continue maintenance work and be reimbursed "for the actual audited costs incurred." Within a couple of weeks, Swick had concluded such agreements with seven cities and towns, from Douglas in southeastern Alaska to Nome on the Seward Peninsula. In reviewing the documents, Washington noted the wide variance in maintenance cost per mile. Snow removal would constitute the greatest part of the costs, and headquarters expected expenditures to be proportionate to snowfall and icing conditions, but no such pattern seemed apparent. Swick was to see to it that a relationship between weather conditions and maintenance costs be established, and that provisions be made for inspection by Bureau personnel. Another issue concerned the acquisition of excess federal property in Alaska by the Bureau at no cost. Previously, federal agencies had transferred surplus property to the Alaska Road Commission without reimbursement. The Bureau's general counsel examined the appropriate federal laws and concluded that the Bureau, as successor agency to the Alaska Road Commission, enjoyed the same privileges.²⁸

The year 1957 had been an eventful one, and A.F. Ghiglione, now the chief of the Foreign Program Division of the Bureau of Public Roads, summed up the major milestones. He reminded the officials that the Bureau took over a system of highways totaling 4,000 miles developed by the ARC over a 51 year period. From 1948 to 1956, the ARC had spent about \$200 million on improving and paving the main highway network and installing modern and efficient maintenance camps and depots throughout the territory. In effect, the BPR, when absorbing the ARC, had taken over a competent highway department similar to those existing in the various western states. Forest highways previously built and maintained by the BPR in Alaska totaled approximately 300 miles. Integrating forest highways with the rest of the territorial system had made possible operating economies.²⁹

Ghiglione pointed out that Alaska had no operating highway department although the territorial legislature had passed legislation in 1957 establishing the authority for a highway department. The ARC and the BPR had helped territorial legislators to draft the measure based on model highway legislation. He summarized the provisions of the law, and mentioned that all highway-user tax monies collected by the territory were made available for use by the Alaska Highway & Public Works Department. The territory collected a 5 cent fuel tax but charged only nominal fees for automobile and truck registration. Nevertheless, territorial income from these sources amounted to \$2.2 million annually.²⁹

Ghiglione maintained that since the BPR had taken over highway construction and maintenance in Alaska very few changes had occurred in the field work. Construction on old projects had continued and new ones started. Government forces still handled all maintenance work. More importantly, "the scope of work possible under the Federal-aid funds is

approximately the same as the level maintained during the past 8 years under the Department of the Interior." What he did not mention was that Alaska's 1956 inclusion in the FAHA assured predictable, and slowly increasing federal aid monies. Unlike the yearly budget battles for ARC appropriations before a fickle Congress, the FAHA monies assured stability and made possible long-range planning.³⁰

Federal aid monies could be used for highway maintenance in Alaska unlike elsewhere, and only required 10 percent territorial matching. Nevertheless, this modest matched consumed most of the territorial highway funds, and Ghiglione predicted that some time would pass before Alaska could take over the maintenance and construction responsibilities normally carried out by a highway department in the contiguous states. He warned that conveying responsibilities would necessitate the transfer of property and personnel since all camps, maintenance equipment and personnel had to remain with the territory. He praised the Bureau for adapting the rigid and bureaucratic federal aid system to Alaska. Indeed, much had been accomplished in the transition period from the ARC to the BPR from September 1956 to December 1957. Many problems, however, remained to be solved.

FOOTNOTES

1. C.D. Curtiss to A.F. Ghiglione, January 2, 1957, box 65403, file AF3-1-4, Territory, R.G. 30, Federal Records Center, Seattle, Washington.
2. E.H. Swick to J.C. Allen, June 4, 1957, J.C. Allen to C.W. Enfield, June 10, 1957, 62-A-1283, box 65, R.G. 30, Washington Federal Records Center, Suitland, Maryland; M.B. Christensen to G.M. William, "Approv-

ing PS&E and authorizing construction on Federal-aid projects in Alaska," August 2, 1957, 62-A-1283, box 66, Central Correspondence files, Alaska Forest Highways, 1957-58, Washington Federal Records Center, Suitland, Maryland.

3. "Report on Status of Appropriation Accounts for the Period Ended June 30, 1957" August 8, 1957, E.F. Allen to M.W. Bales, August 20, 1957, box 65403, box 1 of 1, file AF3-3, Status of Funds, 1957, 1958, R.G. 30, Federal Records Center, Seattle, Washington.
4. Undated newspaper clips, "Road Planning in Final Stages At Meeting of Officials Here," "Approve U.S. Funds for Alaska Roads," E.L. Bartlett Papers, box 5, Federal Departments and Agencies, Interior, Roads, 1945-58, University of Alaska Archives, Fairbanks, Alaska; E.E. Shelhamer to E.S. Haseltin, July 18, 1957, box 65403, file AF3-1-4, Territory, R.G. 30, Federal Records Center, Seattle, Washington.
5. M.B. Christensen to G.M. Williams, "Alaska Trips of Messrs. Christensen, Palmer and Wall (Highway Status and Design and Construction Problems)," August 6, 1957, John L. Palmer, "Maintenance Report on Highways in Alaska," July 1957, 62-A-1283, box 66, Central Correspondence Files, Alaska Forest Highways, 1957-58, R.G. 30, Washington Federal Records Center, Suitland, Maryland.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid.

12. John H. Wall, "Alaska-Construction," July 16, 1957, 62-A-1283, box 66, Central Correspondence Files, Alaska Forest Highways, 1957-58, R.G. 30, Washington Federal Records Center, Suitland, Maryland.
13. Ibid.
14. Ibid.
15. Ibid.
16. Ibid., M.B. Christensen to G.M. Williams, "Alaska Trips of Messrs. Christensen, Palmer and Wall (Highway Status and Design and Construction Problems)," August 6, 1957, 62-A-1283, box 66, Central Correspondence Files, Alaska Forest Highways, 1957-58, R.G. 30, Washington Federal Records Center, Suitland, Maryland.
17. Eric E. Erhart to Paul F. Royster, July 26, 1957, Paul F. Royster to Eric E. Erhart, July 31, 1957, F.C. Turner to Paul F. Royster, July 31, 1957, 62-A-1283, box 66, Central Correspondence Files, Alaska Forest Highways, 1957-58, R.G. 30, Washington Federal Records Center, Suitland, Maryland.
18. M.B. Christensen to G.M. Williams, "Federal-aid procedures in Alaska," August 1, 1957, 62-A-1283, box 66, Central Correspondence Files, Alaska Forest Highways, 1957-58, R.G. 30, Washington Federal Records Center, Suitland, Maryland.
19. M.B. Christensen to E.E. Erhart, August 1, 1957, 62-A-1283, box 66, Central Correspondence Files, Alaska Forest Highways, 1957-58, R.G. 30, Washington Federal Records Center, Suitland, Maryland. Monthly inspections and reports in the contiguous states corresponded with the provisions of PPM-20-6.
20. M.B. Christensen to G.M. Williams, "Bid guaranty for Federal-aid projects in Alaska," August 1, 1957, 62-A-1283, box 66, Central

Correspondence Files, Alaska Forest Highways, 1957-58, R.G. 30, Washington Federal Records Center, Suitland, Maryland.

21. M.B. Christensen to G.M. Williams, "Affirmative findings for force account work on Federal-aid projects in Alaska," August 2, 1957, 62-A-1283, box 66, Central Correspondence Files, Alaska Forest Highways, 1957-58, R.G. 30, Washington Federal Records Center, Suitland, Maryland.
22. M.B. Christensen to G.M. Williams, "Alaska Federal-aid Highway Programming," August 8, 1957, 62-A-1283, box 66, Central Correspondence Files, Alaska, Federal Aid General, thru 16, 1955-59, Washington Federal Records Center, Suitland, Maryland.
23. Bureau of Public Roads, box 65414, file FAH 14, Programs 1956-1958, R.G. 30, Federal Records Center, Seattle, Washington.

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS - REGION 10 - ALASKA

Factors for Consideration in Distribution of Funds to Judicial Districts

July 1957

Percentage Distribution to Judicial Districts

FACTORS	1	2	3	4	TOTAL
Area *	5	25	24	46	100%
Primary mileage	22	-	55	23	"
Secondary mileage	10	12	40	38	"
Total mileage *	15	8	45	32	"
Population (civilian) *	21	4	51	24	"
Rural	18	5	50	27	"
Urban	27	-	54	19	"
Vehicle Registration *	11	1	64	24	"
Gasoline Receipts *	12	4	63	24	"
Preliminary Needs Analysis *	22	2	47	29	"
Weighted selected factors	14	8	49	29	"

*Factors used in weighting

24. M.B. Christensen to G.M. Williams, "Alaska Federal-aid Highway Programming," August 8, 1957, E.H. Swick to district engineers, Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau, Valdez, and Nome, "Alaska Federal-aid Programs," July 30, 1957, box 65414, file FAH 14, Programs 1956-1958, R.G. 30, Federal Records Center, Seattle, Washington.

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS - REGION 10 - ALASKA

Preliminary Distribution of 1959 Federal-aid Monies Available for Construction to Judicial Districts Based on Selected Factors

	Districts				
	1	2	3	4	TOTAL
Primary *	\$ 700,000	-	\$3,000,000	\$1,900,000	\$ 5,600,000
Secondary **	400,000	\$700,000	1,600,000	900,000	3,600,000
Forest	<u>1,100,000</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>700,000</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>1,800,000</u>
TOTAL	2,200,000	700,000	5,300,000	2,800,000	11,000,000
(Percentage)	(20)	(7)	(48)	(25)	(100)

** District 2 - Since it has no Primary System, gets 8% of Federal-aid funds, all from Secondary.

Districts 1, 3 and 4 split remaining \$2,900,000 on ratio 14 to 49 to 29 (see factors, Sheet 1).

* The Primary funds due District 2 under factors analysis were arbitrarily divided evenly between Districts 3 and 4.

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS - REGION 10 - ALASKA

Preliminary Analysis - 1959 Federal-aid Funds for Programing

<u>FUNDS</u>	<u>PRIMARY</u>	<u>SECONDARY</u>	<u>URBAN</u>	<u>FOREST HIGHWAY</u>	<u>TOTALS</u>
1959 Estimate - Revenues	\$8,843,591	\$5,963,607	\$ 73,729	\$2,475,000	\$17,355,927
<u>FIXED CHARGES</u>					
Maintenance:					
Estimate for 1958	1,860,000	1,840,000	---		
Forest maintenance (475,000)	---	---	---	475,000	
City maintenance (estimate)	60,000	---	72,623		
Building replacement & repair	400,000	---	---		
Safety - guard rail - 2% Primary	176,000	---	---		
Subtotal maintenance	2,496,000	1,840,000	72,623		4,408,623
1 1/2% Planning	133,404	90,504	1,106		
Total Fixed Charges	2,629,404	1,930,504	73,729		4,633,637
Gross available to program	6,200,000	4,000,000	---	2,000,000	12,200,000
Reserve for surveys 3%	186,000	120,000		60,000	
Reserve for contingencies 7%	434,000	280,000		140,000	
Total reserve	620,000	400,000		200,000	1,220,000
Net to program (rounded)	5,600,000	3,600,000		1,800,000	11,000,000

PRELIMINARY FY 1959 PROJECTS

1st JUDICIAL DISTRICT

<u>JUNEAU DISTRICT</u>	<u>Primary</u>	<u>Secondary</u>
Mitkof Highway Extension		\$ 500,000
Ketchikan Street Program	\$ 300,000	
Tee Harbor-Eagle River Improvement* (8.5 miles)	1,275,000	
Thane Road Extension (2 miles)		350,000

2nd JUDICIAL DISTRICT

NOME DISTRICT

Nome-Teller		400,000
Nome-Kougarok		300,000

3rd JUDICIAL DISTRICT

ANCHORAGE AND VALDEZ DISTRICT

King River Bridge Replacement	225,000	
Packsaddle Bridge Replacement	25,000	
Gambell Street-Fireweed Lane Improvement	500,000	
Wasilla-Willow Construction (9 miles)		500,000
Kodiak Island Roads Improvement		200,000
Sterling Highway Improvement (1/2 of Section C - 20 miles)	1,100,000	
Paving 34 miles @ \$50,000 (Anchorage- Palmer Area)		1,700,000
Edgerton Cutoff Bridges		250,000

4th JUDICIAL DISTRICT

FAIRBANKS DISTRICT

Nenana-Fairbanks (sec. C, 20 miles)	1,200,000	
Livengood-Manley Hot Springs		400,000
Paving 26 miles @ \$60,000 (Fairbanks Area)		1,560,000
Richardson Highway, 4 lane (6 miles)	900,000	

FOREST HIGHWAY

	<u>PRIMARY</u>	<u>SECONDARY</u>
Cordova-Cordova Airport Improvements		500,000
Portage Glacier Road Improvements		400,000
Hope Road Improvements		50,000
Mitkof Highway Extension*		
Tee Harbor-Eagle River*		
North Sitka Highway Extension 1-1/2 miles		

*Possible to finance partially with Forest Highway money and partially with Federal-Aid monies.

25. E.H. Swick to E.H. Holmes, August 9, 1957, box 65414, file FAH 14, Programs 1956-1958, R.G. 30, Federal Records Center, Seattle, Washington.
26. Ibid.; Lacey V. Murrow to E.H. Swick, September 6, 1957, 62-A-1283, box 65, R.G. 30, Washington Federal Records Center, Suitland, Maryland.
27. E.H. Swick to district engineers, September 17, 1957, John M. Cooley to E.H. Swick, October 4, 1957, H.W. Johansen to E.H. Swick, October 11, 1957, M.C. Zimmerman to E.H. Swick, October 14, 1957, Chr. F. Wyller to E.H. Swick, October 14, 1957, box 65414, file FAH 14, Programs 1956-1958, R.G. 30, Federal Records Center, Seattle, Washington; G.M. Williams to E.H. Swick, October 18, 1957, 62-A-1283, box 66, Central Correspondence Files, Federal Aid, thru 1955-59, R.G. 30, Washington Federal Records Center, Suitland, Maryland.

VALDEZ DISTRICT
October 4, 1957

The following is a list of projects that are recommended for the Valdez District with their priority.

A. Construction:

1. Gakona Bank Protection from the Copper River on Route F-046 at about Mile 2. It is estimated that to protect the roadway from the Copper River cutting the roadway away will cost approximately \$100,000.00

2. Replace Rock Creek Bridge at Mile 86.05 on Route F-071. The present bridge is a wooden trestle constructed in 1947 and has given us trouble every spring during the breakup. It is estimated it will cost approximately \$25,000.00 to replace.

3. Replace the Lower Tonsina Bridge and construct a dike about 2,000 ft. long on Route S-851 to channel the water under the bridge. The estimated cost is approximately \$250,000.00

4. Continue the reconstruction of the Lake Louise Road Route S-809 to the standards of our secondary roads. Estimated cost for next years work \$65,000.00.

5. Redeck the Lower Low River Bridge at Mile 14.7 on Route F-071. Estimated cost approximately \$30,000.00

6. Reconstruction of the Copper River Highway Route S-851 from 9 Mile to the airport at about 14 Mile. This would be the widening and raising of the roadway and replacing the wooden bridges. It is estimated to cost approximately \$500,000.00.

7. Reconstruction of the Mineral Creek Road Route S-8151 between 5 Mile and 9 Mile. Estimated cost \$50,000.00.

8. Construction of Section "A" Edgerton Highway, Route S-851. Estimated cost approximately \$500,000.00.

9. Construction of a bridge across the Copper River on Route S-850 about Chitina. Estimated cost approximately \$1,500,000.00.

10. Asphalt deck protection of the laminated floor decking on the steel trusses on the Copper River Highway Route S-851. Estimated cost approximately \$25,000.00.

11. Painting the steel trusses on the Copper River Highway Route S-851. Estimated cost approximately \$200,000.00.

12. Reconstruction and paving on Section "A" Denali Highway, Route F-052 - a three year contract with no paving to be done until the second year. Estimated cost \$2,400,000.00.

13. Paving of Mineral Creek Road, Route S-8151 - the section in the Town of Valdez from the junction of Route F-071 to the Dike Bridge, a distance of approximately 0.5 mile. Estimated cost of \$50,000.00.

14. Construction of a new road from 5½ Mile on the Richardson Highway, Route F-071 to the head of Robe Lake, approximately ¾ of a mile. Estimated cost \$20,000.00. This would be a Territory project.

15. New construction of a section of road from Chitina to McCarthy for about 25 miles. Estimated cost of \$500,000.00.

B. Maintenance:

The maintenance programmed funds as set up for the 1957 program should take care of our requirements if spring breakup does not do anymore damage than it has done in the past few years. The maintenance program for the 1958 season for primary maintenance should be increased from \$750,000.00 to \$850,000.00 to take care of the centerline striping, guard rail installation, additional maintenance which will be required on asphalt patching on Richardson Highway between junction at 129 Mile and Summit Lake, 195 Mile, and to take care of the maintenance of the Denali Highway.

The maintenance program for the secondary maintenance should be increased from \$160,000.00 to \$200,000.00 to take care of the

additional mileage on the secondary routes and to increase our secondary maintenance to a little higher standards.

C. Buildings:

1. The camp at Eureka, Route F-942, should be replaced with a complete new maintenance camp.

2. The camp at 47 Mile, Route F-071, should be replaced with a complete new camp and the new camp should be located at 59 Mile so the division of maintenance area will be better distributed and also 80% of the work from this camp is between 58 Mile and 75 Mile.

3. Construction of a maintenance camp on the Denali Highway, Route F-052, near the Susitna River for the maintenance of the section of the route from the MacLaren River to about 30 miles north of the Susitna River. This camp may be needed for the Anchorage District depending on where the division of the Denali Highway is made.

4. Construction of a new maintenance camp near Fielding Lake, Route F-071, about 203 Mile for winter maintenance of Isabel Pass if in the future this route is to be kept open the year around.

5. Paint the Valdez Tank Farm. A contract to paint the Tank Farm should be let so that the painting could be started by about the 20th of May.

6. The old garage at Valdez should be removed this coming year and it is possible that it could be sold with the provision that it be removed in 60 days. After the old shop has been removed a security fence should be constructed around the area.

7. A seven car garage should be constructed at Thompson Pass to allow the employees stationed there during the winter to store their cars so they would be protected against the heavy snow.

D. Highway Safety and Traveler Conveniences:

It was requested under maintenance that the maintenance allotment be increased by \$100,000.00 to take care of centerline striping and the installation of guard rail in areas like Thompson Pass and other dangerous places throughout the district.

Our present signs pertaining to alignment and speed have all been replaced or are new and it is estimated that 90% or more are in good condition. For the Valdez District it is recommended that a type of paint similar to "Codit", a reflective liquid No. 7210 made by Minnesota Mining and 3M Manufacturing Company of St. Paul 6, Minnesota, be used to paint just the arrow on our alignment signs and the number on the speed signs would be adequate to improve our signing problems.

E. Surveys:

1. To continue the survey of another 25 miles on the section of the proposed route between Chitina and McCarthy.

2. To begin a survey of about a 25 mile section from Chitina down the Copper River toward Cordova.

F. Length of the Work Week:

It is recommended that the work week on a whole be set up for 40 hours. The exceptions to a 40 hour week would be that the maintenance crew for Thompson Pass, Paxson and Trimms be set up for a 48 hour week for approximately the 1st of November to the 1st of April. During the spring breakup all maintenance camps should be on a 48 hour week to take care of culverts and the heavy runoff. All maintenance shops should be on a 40 hour week throughout the year.

All engineering crews should work contractor's hours.

FAIRBANKS DISTRICT
October 10, 1957

Following is a summary of recommendations for the Fairbanks District for the 1958 season:

Construction

A. Primary Construction

1.	Redeck and pave Salchaket and Tanana River Bridges - 1,000 feet at \$100.00	\$100,000.00
2.	Replace bulkheads - Salchaket Bridge	20,000.00
3.	Grade and surface Section C - Fairbanks-Nenana from Mile 29.8 to Tanana River	700,000.00
4.	Bituminous paving - Steese Highway Mile 2 to Mile 4	80,000.00
5.	Grade and pave - Fairbanks-Nenana from Mile 4 to Mile 6	160,000.00
6.	Obtain right-of-way on Alaska Highway (Richardson) from Big Bend-Fairbanks to North end of Badger Road - 6 Mile Gate	60,000.00
7.	Obtain right-of-way on University Avenue for entire section between Fairbanks-Nenana Highway and International Airport Spur	40,000.00

A. Primary Construction (continued)

8.	Paving - Alaska Highway - Mile 1294 to Mile 1264 - 30 miles @ \$40,000.00	1,200,000.00
9.	Paving - Alaska Highway - Mile 1964 to Mile 1222 - 42 miles @ \$30,000	<u>1,260,000.00</u>
	Total:	\$ 3,620,000.00
	Plus 10%:	<u>362,000.00</u>
		\$3,982,000.00

B. Secondary Construction

1.	Livengood-Eureka - Road construction to complete project to Eureka on force account basis.	400,000.00
2.	Chena Hot Springs - Build tote road from end of this season's work on Chena Hot Springs to enable final follow up of design survey	200,000.00
3.	Livengood-Eureka-Bridge Construction - (a) West Fork Tolovana 75,000.00 (b) Hutlinana River 30,000.00 (c) Baker Creek 80,000.00 (d) Manley Slough with line change <u>140,000.00</u>	325,000.00
4.	Taylor Highway - Complete grading on Boundary Spur and complete regrading and gravelling between Mt. Fairplay and Tetlin Junction	100,000.00
5.	Grade and surface - Nenana-McKinley Park Road - Nenana to Rex - 30 miles	900,000.00
6.	Grade and pave - Phillips Field Road, Route FAS 6321 - 2.7 miles	190,000.00
7.	Obtain rights of way for reconstruction on the following: (a) FAS 620 Badger Loop, 12.1 miles 20,000.00 (b) FAS 644 Farmers Loop, 9.0 miles 15,000.00 (c) FAS 624 Minnie, 3rd Street, Trainer Gate, Dawson Spur. (1) Third St. & Dawson Spur 20,000.00 (2) Trainer Road & 3rd Ave. <u>40,000.00</u>	95,000.00
8.	Grading and paving - Trainer Road, Third Avenue, Third Street, & Dawson Spur	170,000.00

B. Secondary Construction (continued)

9. Grading and paving - Badger Loop Road	1,000,000.00
10. Bridge construction - North Fork 12 Mile River	<u>125,000.00</u>
Total:	\$ 3,505,000.00
Plus 10%:	<u>350,500.00</u>
	\$ 3,855,500.00

Maintenance

Primary maintenance funds, exclusive of depot improvements, do not appear at this time to be sufficient to cover regular routine primary maintenance between now and June 30, 1958. It is assumed maintenance funds for the City of Fairbanks will be from our primary and secondary funds. The obligation of the primary portion of such funds will deplete present primary fund balance to a point where it will not be sufficient to carry on normal anticipated primary expenditures.

In setting up funds for the year, July 1, 1957 to July 1, 1958, funding between primary routes and secondary routes pretty much agrees with past expenditures on through routes and feeders and local routes. With the new route designations, the Ester-Nenana section and the section from Farmers Loop to Fox on the Steese became a part of the primary system whereas they had formerly been in our old feeder system. This differential has caused an unbalanced distribution between primary and secondary funds.

Our secondary maintenance funds appear ample to cover normal secondary maintenance operations to July 1, 1958, as well as the following:

1. Primary and Secondary maintenance to July 1, 1958 - City of Fairbanks	45,000.00
2. Deficiency in primary maintenance funds, estimated	35,000.00

It was our intention to start crushing and stockpiling aggregate for plant mix by mid-May and to start major paving repair program around June 1st. In order to do this work, we will require an additional \$35,00.00 in our primary maintenance account to carry through to July 1st. This is all based on normal maintenance from now to June 30th. Any abnormal winter and spring conditions may alter this considerably.

The following bridges on the primary system are in need of painting:

1.	Chena River, Fairbanks	400 feet
2.	Big Gerstle River	1800 "
3.	Johnson River	960 "
4.	Robertson River	1980 "
5.	Yerrick-Creek	200 "
6.	Tok River	250 "
7.	Tanana (East of Tok)	950 "

On the secondary system, the following bridges require painting:

1.	Tolovana (Elliott)	125 feet
2.	Tatalina (Elliott)	100 "
3.	Illinois Street (FAS 671)	130 "
4.	Minnie Street (FAS 624)	130 "

It is planned to paint all the secondary bridges listed above this coming year and to paint the Chena and Big Gerstle on the primary system this coming season. It is planned to do this work by contract.

For the year July 1, 1958 to July 1, 1959, we propose to do the following work over and above the funds allocated for the year July 1, 1957 to July 1, 1958. To perform this work, we estimate our primary maintenance allocations will have to be increased in the amounts listed below:

1.	Pavement Repair - Alaska and Glenn Highways	\$ 50,000.00
2.	Centerline Striping:	
	(a) Alaska Highway	\$ 30,000.00
	(b) Richardson Highway	3,900.00
	(c) Fairbanks-Nenana Road	1,000.00
	(d) Glenn Highway	3,500.00
	(e) Steese Highway	<u>200.00</u>
		38,600.00
3.	Guard Rail Installation - Alaska Highway - 5500 feet	30,000.00
4.	Bridge painting - Chena and Big Gerstle River Bridge	65,000.00
5.	Maintenance Fairbanks City Primary Route	28,000.00
6.	Increase to cover estimated normal maintenance deficiency	<u>35,000.00</u>
	Additional funds required for 1958-1959 Primary Maintenance	\$ 246,600.00

As noted above in this report, we estimate \$80,000.00 in funds over and above our normal maintenance expenditures on secondary maintenance for this year. For the year July 1, 1958 to July 1, 1959, we desire to have the same allocation as for 1957-1958. We propose to use this money to replace the following timber bridges:

1. Quarts Creek, Steese Highway
2. Albert Creek, " "
3. Mosquito Creek, " "
4. Bear Pup, Ruby-Long-Poorman Road
5. Monument Creek, - Ruby-Long-Poorman Road
6. Ophir Creek - Ruby-Long-Poorman Road

In addition, we will require the following funds:

1. Paint, Illinois Street Bridge)	
Minnie Street Bridge)	9,000.00
Tolovana & Tatalina Bridges)	
2. Centerline Striping	100.00
3. Maintenance Fairbanks City Secondary Rte.	<u>42,000.00</u>
Additional funds for 1958-1959	
Secondary Maintenance	\$ 51,100.00

Buildings

A. Replacement & Additions:

1. Gardiner Creek Camp
2. Birch Lake Garage Addition and Living Quarters
3. Fairbanks Depot - Warm Storage Facilities & Service Station
4. Fairbanks Depot - Administrative Office and Engineering Office Building
5. Johnson River Camp

B. Improvements:

1. Fairbanks Depot - Paint office and warm storage buildings.
2. Fairbanks Depot - Shingle apartment building.
3. Design standard sand drying and storage shed and construct one each at:
 1. Fairbanks
 2. Birch Lake
 3. Big Delta
 4. Johnson River
 5. Tok Junction
 6. Gardiner Creek (new site)

Surveys

1. Survey for Design - Rex to Dry Creek
2. Survey for Design - Alaska Highway-Moose Creek Dyke to South Gate - Eielson Field
3. Ground control survey - Fairbanks to Big Delta - to tie in present highway to Mendenhall Aerial photos.
4. Control Survey - Steese Highway - Fox to Circle - to tie in 1957 photogrammetric survey.

Surveys (continued)

5. Design survey - Chena Hot Springs Road - Mile 22 to Chena Hot Springs.
6. Photogrammetric survey - Eagle to Circle along south bank of Yukon River.
7. Ground control for Aerial and as-built survey - Elliott Highway - Fox to Livengood.
8. Ground control for aerial and as-built survey - Taylor Highway - Tetlin Junction to Eagle.

NOME DISTRICT
October 11, 1957

Submitted below is a summary of recommended projects for the consideration of the Territorial Highway Board that they might formulate their 1958 program.

CONSTRUCTION

Proj. #1	Nome - Kougarok Route 141 Completion grading by force account and contract.	\$300,000
Proj. #2	Golden Gate Creek to Pilgrim Hot Springs Preliminary grading by force account.	60,000
Proj. #3	Teller Road Route 131 Preliminary grading and two bridges by contract and by force account.	400,000
Proj. #4	Coyote Creek to Bering Dock Site. Preliminary grading by contract rental equipment.	70,000

The most feasible method of accomplishing Project #2 is to do the work on #2 with the crew from Project #1 while they are in the immediate area. The same thoughts are borne regarding Project #4 with respect to #3.

RECONSTRUCTION

Proj. #1	Nome to Municipal Airport Route 130 Engineering early in the spring of 1958 with construction of bridge and grading through one snow trap accomplished the same year.	75,000
Proj. #2	Nome to Mile 13 Route 130 Engineering accomplished 1958 with plans to let the contract in the spring of 1959.	30,000
Proj. #3	Kougarok to Haycock Route 141 Engineering by aerial photogrammetry.	50,000

Proj. #4	Nome to Mile 13 Route 141 Engineering during 1958 with plans to let the contract by spring 1959 for grading and the construction of one bridge.	30,000
Proj. #5	Safety Ferry to Solomon Surfacing and minor alignment improvement by contract.	80,000

MAINTENANCE

Summer

Erection of signs, bridge rails, some guard rails, repair and replacement of culverts, ditch cleaning, spring washout repairs, ferry operation, grading of snow traps and surface blading of all roads in the Nome District \$160,000

Winter

Snow removal, widening, berming snow fences et cetera including maintenance through the City of Nome 25,000

Buildings

1. Central heat plant for Nome Depot 70,000
Construction by contract.
2. Additional housing, four units for Nome Depot 120,000
Construction by contract.
3. Summer maintenance camp Route 131 25,000
By force account.

It is proposed to provide summer maintenance for the following routes:

Route 130	1321
131	1411
141	1412
1301	1413
1304	1451
1311	1510
	1550

This work is to include opening routes 130, 131, 141 and 1550 - consisting of plowing remaining snow drifts, removing the remnants of winter glaciating, and make spring washout repairs during the spring of 1959. The remaining routes listed above will not be opened until all snow and ice has melted unless public pressure justifies opening earlier.

These routes require ditch and culvert cleaning, minor bridge repairs and painting, traffic sign installation, spot gravelling, minor resurfacing, surface blading, sloping, and riprap reinforcement.

Routes 130, 141 and 1411 can have their winter maintenance reduced considerably by grading the few remaining snow traps.

It is planned to install guard rails on all new bridges. These rails will extend a short distance onto the approach fills.

Surface blading remains our greatest maintenance problem. It is doubtful that our present equipment would stand double shifting so we have done the best we could with a single shift. During the 1958 year a new grader is expected - it will be double-shifted and should permit us to keep up with surface blading requirements.

Fill slope repairs and reinforcing of riprap will be required mostly along route 130.

Thought has been given to your suggestion of working maintenance five days per week. Excepting three men, our whole district maintenance crew is composed of temporary employees for whom we have to compete in the local labor market each spring. In the outlying areas such as Teller, Deering et cetera we have been working five days per week the past seasons and expect to continue doing so; however, in the immediate Nome Area it is felt that we would be unable to attract the better men if we cut down to five days per week. It is agreed that if our maintenance crew was composed of permanent employees they would work at five days per week as they do not have the long idle winter months ahead.

Winter Maintenance

Winter maintenance will be provided for those portions of routes 130, 141, 1411 and 1550 whose winter use is required by the economy of Nome and Kotzebue. This maintenance will consist mostly of snow removal, widening, snowfence and winter glaciating control.

No maintenance is contemplated for routes 1050, 1210, 1302, 1303, 1312, 1590 or 1690 as traffic is so low that maintenance is not warranted at this time, private individuals are maintaining for their own use, or the Airforce is maintaining for its use.

CONSTRUCTION

Nome - Kougarok

It is expected that we will accomplish the following by force account the 1958 construction season:

Bridge the Pilgrim River and the Kuzitrin River.

Completion of the preliminary grading, installation of culverts, final grading and short haul surfacing as far as Coffee Creek.

It is proposed that we again contract the surfacing of all materials hauled over 2000 feet and to contract all culvert placement in areas where the contractor does all grading. To finance this work it is expected that the \$110,000 authorized in 1957 program will be made available during the spring of 1958 to carry our work until July 1st. The proposed \$300,000 will be sufficient for both contract and force account work including all engineering until the end of the job unless unforeseen events occur.

Our plans for this work are as follows:

By Force Account

Fabricate a temporary bridge at the Nome Depot this winter in 300 foot sections for the crossing of the Pilgrim River. This bridge will be installed as soon as the road is open to this point and the water and ice have cleared sufficiently. This temporary structure will be cabled to the bank in the event that high water occurs and placed in such a position that a permanent bridge can be erected from it without the use of false work.

Steel for the Pilgrim River Bridge should arrive on the first boat and will be on construction site by the first week in July. Our past experience indicates it will take about six weeks for our crew to erect this bridge at which time we should have access to the Kuzitrin Bridge site provided the contractors have connected through between Mile 61 and Mile 67. Steel for this bridge then can be trucked to the site and the crew can begin erection which will probably not be completed until freeze up.

Preliminary grading with bulldozers will continue with a single shift from Shelton over to Coffee Creek.

The bulldozer crew can then either accomplish the preliminary grading between Golden Gate Creek and Pilgrim Hot Springs, if authorized to do so, or drop back to the Nome River and finish grading those narrow sections that were constructed in 1956 but never widened.

It is planned to move the scraper crew into the area between Mile 28 and Mile 30 early this spring and to finish widening the grade and straightening out the river channel as the river has threatened our grade several times. Approximately three weeks will be required to accomplish this. The crew will then move over to Mile 52 and finish widening and surfacing the road as far as Mile 61 which point will be accessible by auto late in the fall of 1957. Upon completion of this area scrapers will then be moved to the vicinity of Mile 68 for a small amount of scraper work has to be accomplished and then to Shelton and then on to Coffee Creek. These last three areas have spotted and scattered scraper work. It is anticipated that all scraper work can be easily accomplished during the 1958 construction season, if normal conditions occur.

By Contract

It is tentatively planned to grade by contract from Mile 61 to near Mile 67 placing an overlay over the tundra without disturbing it ahead of the fill. At this writing we do not have our borrow pits blocked out and have noted the barest possibility of gravel in the middle of the section which has not yet been prospected. If this middle pit does not prove out, all material will have to be hauled from each end of the section. It is planned to make our stock pile of gasoline in the Kougarok available to the successful contractor that he might haul from the north end with a minimum of supply problems. Considerable long haul servicing may be required between Shelton and Coffee Creek as we do not have full information on the broken rock and dead rock available from the top of the ridge at present.

Teller Road

It is planned to accomplish preliminary grading over a two year period, to erect a replacement bridge over Snake River, and a new one over Penny River. Preliminary grading is to be done by contract equipment and the bridge work by our own forces. If we were not so very short of competent bridge engineers to administer the work, it would be desirable to contract the construction of these two bridges as access is easy from Nome.

Our plans to accomplish this work are as follows:

Preliminary grading will begin at the point where the Teller Road leaves route 141. The work will have ready access for the first nine miles as there is already an existing road. Commuting between the work and town will be practical for possibly two or three miles past the end of the road, then it will be necessary to establish a camp.

It is planned to have the actual work conducted under the supervision and direction of one of the foremen who has been trained in this type of work in the Nome area. The contractor is to provide the equipment, maintenance and operate the camp - boarding our foreman and the occasional transient inspector.

Airstrips constructed by our survey crew every few miles will be available for supplying lighter supplies such as groceries and miscellaneous parts, tools, et cetera. Fuel will have to be hauled along the surface. By making this a two year contract the contractor can start about the middle of the 1958 season progress at a moderate rate and move in his fuel supplies during the 1958 and 1959 winter season. The next season he will be in a position to work the job at whatever rate he desires.

It appears that if we accomplish that bridge work proposed for route 141 our crew will not have the time to complete both the Snake River Bridge and the Penny River Bridge unless the Kuzitrin Bridge is delayed until next season. It is felt that any necessary delays should be reflected on the construction of the Snake and Penny Rivers as they are much less difficult to ford than the Kuzitrin River.

Preparatory to final grading activities it is strongly recommended that an engineering crew follow directly behind the preliminary grading crew taking cross sections, that quantities for final grading can be computed.

RECONSTRUCTION

It is planned to accomplish only the engineering for our proposed reconstruction projects excepting that section on route 130 from Nome to the Municipal Airport. Consideration should be given to paving this section as at that time contractors will have their crusher and related paving equipment here for the reconstruction of the Municipal Airport.

It is felt that a traffic count of 1,100 cars or vehicles per day justifies paving, however, we do not recommend paving into Nome proper until they have solved their water and sewer problems. Possible this paving might be incorporated with that being done by C.A.A. as an extra work order.

PIONEER SURVEYS

At this time we propose only one pioneer survey for the 1958 season from the Kougarok to Haycock route 141.

It is proposed to accomplish engineering via aerial photograph with on the ground spot checking of soil conditions similar to that which has been done for the Nome - Kougarok location. The first staking is then construction staking which is done just ahead of the actual construction. This method worked very well for force account construction and should work just as well for contract rental construction.

These aerial photographs could then be sent to the photogrammetry section in Washington for analysis along with the data we gather from spot checking in the field.

We propose this method of engineering as it has proven much faster and much cheaper on the Nome - Kougarok construction than the conventional method. Our engineering costs so far have been under 3%; however, one thing is lacking, we have no "as built" plans as yet. If desired these "as built" plans can be drawn reasonably accurate from aerial photos.

ANCHORAGE DISTRICT
October 14, 1957

The recommendations are listed in order of priority.

I. CONSTRUCTION AND RECONSTRUCTION

A. Contract	Primary	Secondary
1. Gambell Street Improvement	500,000	
2. King River Bridge	225,000	
3. Packsaddle Bridge	25,000	
4. Paving Anchorage and Palmer Area		
a. Lake Otis Loop (3.8 miles)		190,000
b. Wasilla to Big Lake Junction (9.5 miles)		475,000
c. Sand Lake Road (4.5 miles)		225,000
d. Jewel Lake Road (1.5 miles)		75,000
e. Northern Lights Blvd. (1.5 miles)		75,000
f. Big Lake Junction to Big Lake Y (4.5 miles)		225,000
g. Jonesville Road (2.4 miles)		120,000
h. Palmer to Echo Lake (Palmer- Matanuska Loop)		185,000
5. Sealcoat Seward-Anchorage from Fireweed Lane to Potter (10 miles). Chips are stockpiled on project.	30,000	
6. Sealcoat Sterling B-1E (25 miles)	38,000	
7. Glenn 4 lane (inside military boundary - 7 miles)	400,000	
8. Kodiak Island Road Improvements No engineering has been accomplished at Kodiak. Engineering should be completed on Kalsin Bay Road this winter and contract for reconstr. let in summer of 1958.		200,000
9. Sterling Highway (Soldotna- Clam Gulch - 21 miles)	1,150,000	

	Primary	Secondary
10. Houston - Willow (9 miles) Predecated on clearing being completed early enough to allow survey and design this winter.		500,000
11. Echo Lake to Experiment Farm (Palmer-Matanuska Loop)		165,000
12. Matanuska Trunk Road (Palmer- Matanuska Loop)		125,000
 B. Government Force		
1. Reconstruct Mile 0 to Mile 1 - Edlund Road		10,000
2. Reconstruct Mile 1 to Mile 2 - Farmloop Road		10,000
3. Deception Creek (Willow) Bridge and riprap Replace existing unsafe 60' wooden truss with old Hicks creek bridge.		40,000
4. Moose Creek (Talkeetna) Bridge Replace existing unsafe 60' wooden truss with 2 - 40' I beam spans set on creosoted mud sills and creosoted timber rockfilled piers.		30,000
5. Seward Airport Roads and Bridge Replace inadequate pile bent bridge with I beam structure on cresoted piles.		30,000
 C. National Forests and Parks		
1. McKinley Park (1st 10 miles) (contract)	600,000	
2. Resurrection Creek (Hope, 3 miles) (contract)		50,000
3. Portage Glacier Road (7 miles) (contract)		400,000
4. Hope Road Improvements (By Force Account)		50,000

II. MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS

Due to the July 1 change in cost accounting, we have no adequate background upon which to base any accurate estimate, but it appears that the funds set up this year are adequate. If, however, we are to incorporate refinements such as sodding and seeding, construction and

maintenance of viewpoints, picnic areas, etc., funds will not be adequate to handle the work.

We believe that the standard work week, 48 hours from April 1 to November 1 and 40 hours during the remainder of the year, should be revised and a standard 40 hour work week established for year round operations. The only exceptions should be inspectors on contract work to work contractors' hours as approved by the District Engineer and Resident Engineer. In the winter, shifts should be staggered to cover Saturday operations and if it become necessary to work Sundays or overtime in emergencies, overtime pay should be approved. Actually, visual observation during the past summer, indicates that it is doubtful if we receive full value for working Saturdays. If the 48 hour week is to be retained, we recommend it go into effect Nov. 1 until May 1 and there should be no staggered work week.

Primary Maintenance	800,000
Secondary Maintenance	850,000

III. BUILDINGS

1.	Dillingham Depot (Garage and a one-family dwelling)	150,000
2.	Kalsin Bay Depot (Garage and a one-family dwelling)	150,000
3.	Palmer Engineering Office (Remodel and siding)	5,000
4.	Moose Pass Depot (Survey site only) (Move to Vicinity of Cooper Landing)	5,000
5.	Bethel Depot (Garage)	100,000
6.	94 Mile Depot Improvements (Additional new duplex)	50,000
7.	Anchorage Depot improvements (Addition to Engineering Space)	80,000
8.	Ninilchik Depot (Service Garage)	100,000
9.	Willow Depot (Service Garage and 1-family dwelling)	150,000
10.	Girdwood Depot (Service Garage)	100,000

IV. HIGHWAY SAFETY AND TRAVELER CONVENIENCE

1. Traveler convenience should be part of maintenance program with expansion in money to supply roadside parking, water, entrance to old borrow pits, etc.
 - a. Improve 88 Mile spring
 - b. 102 Mile view point improvement
 - c. Interest point signs
2. Guard Rail - Seward - Anchorage Highway Installation at various locations, 7,000 ft. \$70,000

V. SURVEY AND DESIGN

- | | |
|--|---------|
| 1. Denali D Design (28 miles) | 28,000 |
| 2. Denali C Survey and Design (20 miles) | 50,000 |
| 3. McKinley Park (3rd 10 miles) Survey and Design | 25,000 |
| 4. Uzinki Survey - Kodiak | 60,000 |
| 5. Completion of Willow-Talkeetna Survey | 100,000 |
| 6. Bridge site survey (Naknek - 3 bridges) | 6,000 |
| 7. Kodiak (Kalsin Bay and Anton Larson Bay Relocation Surveys) | 60,000 |
| 8. Homer East End to Fox River Survey | 50,000 |
| 9. N. Kenai to Hope Survey (20 mile section) | 50,000 |
| 10. Anchorage-McGrath Preliminary Study | 100,000 |

JUNEAU DISTRICT
October 14, 1957

The following are proposed construction programs for the Juneau District for fiscal year 1959:

Tongass Hwy., Clover Pass-Lunch Creek - It is proposed to design a road on the old 1930 survey which follows the beach line in order to [do] a definite comparison of costs between it and the line designed on top of the bench. If it is decided to use the beach line, the "L" line should be run in and a design made on it before advertising.

The Haines-Skagway Area - There is considerable mileage of secondary roads which have never been surveyed and which do not have any definite right-of-way. We believe that it is imperative that these roads be surveyed and monumented and ties made to private property and a definite right-of-way established as soon as possible.

It is our recommendation that a survey be made of the Federal Aid Primary Route 95 from the north to the south boundaries of Juneau including the so-called "Outer Drive." While the actual construction of this project is not planned in the immediate future, we believe it is of great importance to get the route established and the right-of-way acquired as soon as possible. This is particularly true where it crosses unoccupied tidelands and also through the properties of the Alaska-Juneau Gold Mining Co. The mill is now being abandoned and demolished and the right-of-way for a through street should be acquired before other developments move in on the land.

The streets of Wrangell are generally in a very bad condition and since we now have taken over the maintenance of the Federal Aid Routes going through the towns we believe that a survey should be made with the plan in mind to reconstruct portions of it as soon as funds can be made available.

The Lump Fund Surveys shown on the list from Forest Highway Funds are proposed to be programmed in order to finish design of current surveys on the Forest Highway System.

Of the three building projects shown on the "Proposed Building Program", repair of the Sitka Shop is the most urgent. The proposed work consists of installing new overhead doors in the main shop and replacing the present failing wood floor in the back part of the shop with a concrete floor. Minor revisions in the interior arrangement to provide better parts facilities are also included in the estimate.

The two other buildings, at Ketchikan and Petersburg, are badly in need of replacement but we believe in both locations a new site should be obtained for the maintenance shop. We propose to make a survey and, if possible, obtain new sites this coming year with the idea of recommending construction of new buildings in the F.Y. 1960. We believe it would be advantageous to allocate, say \$10,000, to each of these two locations for survey and site acquisition. Our overall estimate of costs at these two places is based on use of prefabricated metal buildings on concrete foundations.

Centerline striping, signs and guard rail have been included in the maintenance costs. The analysis of maintenance costs shows a tabulation giving the amount of guard rail which we estimate to be placed at the various locations. The cost of material, amounting to a total of \$18,000, is included in the allotment to the various stations for Materials and Supplies while the cost of erection is included in the salaries.

We are definitely opposed to the summertime overtime on maintenance except when needed for some emergency. There is an adequate

labor supply and, if the regular crew is not sufficient to accomplish all the work as it is planned, it would be a simple matter to employ temporary help as needed. In the Juneau District we believe it would be very rarely necessary to hire additional help. We, therefore, recommend that the six-day work week be discontinued.

PROPOSED SURVEYS

F.Y. 1959

	<u>Federal Aid Route</u>	<u>F.H. Route</u>	<u>Proposed Allocation</u>	
Tongass Hwy.--Clover Pass- Lunch Creek	920	1	\$ 20,000	F.H.
Monumentation Survey, Secondary Roads, Haines-Skagway, Area		-	20,000	F.A.S.
Juneau Streets (Outer Drive)	95	-	10,000	F.A.P.
Wrangell Streets	943	-	10,000	F.A.S.
Lump Fund Surveys			20,000	F.H.
Totals			40,000	F.H.
			10,000	F.A.P.
			<u>30,000</u>	F.A.S.
GRAND TOTAL			\$ 80,000	

PROPOSED BUILDING PROGRAM

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Proposed Allocation</u>
1	Sitka (Repairs - Existing Building)	\$ 10,000
2	Ketchikan (New Building & Location)	125,000
3	Petersburg (New Building and Location)	100,000

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS
REGION 10, ALASKA, JUNEAU DISTRICT

ESTIMATE OF MAINTENANCE COSTS FISCAL YEAR 1959

	<u>Regular Salaries</u>	<u>Apr.-Nov. Overtime</u>	<u>Winter Overtime</u>	<u>Equipment Rentals</u>	<u>Materials & Supplies</u>	<u>City Maintenance</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Juneau	\$ 77,000	\$ 14,000	\$ 9,000	\$ 63,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 7,000	\$ 190,000
Haines	63,000	11,000	9,000	70,000	15,000	4,000	172,000
Ketchikan	50,000	8,500	1,500	36,000	11,000	7,000	114,000
Sitka	14,000	2,400	500	15,000	4,000	2,000	37,900
Skagway	14,000	2,400	500	12,000	2,000	2,000	32,900
Petersburg	14,500	2,500	1,000	12,000	2,000	3,000	35,000
Wrangell	14,000	2,400	1,000	12,000	2,000	3,000	34,400
Hyder	12,000	2,400	500	6,000	2,000	--	22,900
Annette Island	--	--	--	--	--	10,000	10,000
Supervisor	10,000	--	--	--	--	--	10,000
TOTALS	\$268,500	\$ 45,600	\$23,000	\$226,000	\$ 58,000	\$ 38,000	\$ 659,100

SUMMARY:

Labor	\$ 268,500
Overtime - Summer	45,600
Overtime - Winter	23,000
Equipment Rentals	226,000
Materials & Supplies	58,000
City Maintenance	<u>38,000</u>
Total - F.Y. 1959	659,100
Less Summer Overtime	<u>45,600</u>
TOTAL	\$ 613,500

GUARD RAIL ESTIMATES

Haines	- 1500 lin. ft.	\$ 6,000
Juneau	- 1000 lin. ft.	4,000
Ketchikan	- 1000 lin. ft.	4,000
Sitka	- 1000 lin. ft.	<u>4,000</u>
TOTAL		\$ 18,000 (Included in Materials & supplies above)

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS
REGION 10, ALASKA, JUNEAU DISTRICT

PROPOSED THREE YEAR PROGRAM

Priority	Project	Route	Route Length	Estimated Cost	Estimated Cost By Funds			Remarks	
					F. A. P.	F. A. S.	F. H.		
<u>FISCAL YEAR 1959</u>									
1	*Douglas Bridge Repairs	95	31	-	\$ 50,000	50,000		Repair of Main Piers	
2	**Sitka Hwy. Bridges	933	11	0.1	150,000		150,000	New construction to replace old temporary structures.	
3	Ketchikan Street Improvements	95	-	1.1	500,000	500,000		Grading and paving of street	
4	Sitka Street Improvements	933	-	1.9	400,000		400,000	Grading Street	
5	**Mitkof Highway Extension	937	7	7.3	900,000		700,000	New Construction, Grading	
6	**Glacier Hwy.-Thane-DuPont	975	2	2.0	150,000		150,000	To match \$125,000 Terr. 25% Funds	
7	**Glacier Hwy. Duck Creek-Mendenhall Glacier	966) 968)	2	5.0	500,000		500,000	Reconstruction, Grading	
8	*Glacier Hwy. Wadleigh Cr. Bridge	95	2	0.02	30,000		30,000	Widening & new deck on present structure	
9	*Glacier Hwy. Switzer Bridge	95	2	0.05	100,000		100,000	Reconstruction Bridge	
10	**Glacier Hwy. Montana Cr. Bridge	966	2	0.02	75,000		75,000	Reconstruction Bridge	
TOTAL PROPOSED -- F.Y. 1959					2,855,000	550,000	1,100,000	1,205,000	
<u>FISCAL YEAR 1960</u>									
11	Sitka Streets, Paving	933	-	1.9	200,000		200,000		
12	*Glacier Hwy., Tee Harbor-Eagle R.	95	2	8.5	1,500,000	700,000		800,000	
13	**Tongass Hwy., Clover Pass-Lunch Cr.	920	1	3.0	800,000			800,000	
14	**Glacier Hwy., Fritz Cove Road	970	2	2.7	400,000		400,000		
TOTAL PROPOSED -- F.Y. 1960					2,900,000	700,000	600,000	1,600,000	
<u>FISCAL YEAR 1961</u>									
15	**Glacier Hwy., Loop Sec., Fritz Cove Road, Paving	966) 968) 970)	2	11.5	950,000		950,000		
16	**Tongass Hwy., Whipple Cr.-Pt. Higgins	920	1	2.2	700,000			700,000	
17	Ketchikan Street Improvements	95	-	1.0	700,000	700,000			
TOTAL PROPOSED -- F.Y. 1961					2,350,000	700,000	950,000	700,000	(Section First Half of Whipple Cr.-Clover Pass

* Eligible for F.A.P. & F.H. Funds
** Eligible for F.A.S. & F.H. Funds

28. E.H. Swick to Paul F. Royster, October 10, 1957, 62-A-1283, box 65, Paul F. Royster to C.W. Enfield, October 21, 1957, 62-A-1283, box 66, Central Correspondence Files, Federal Aid General, thru 1955-59, R.G. 30, Washington Federal Records Center, Suitland, Maryland; G.M. Williams to J.C. Allen and C.W. Enfield, November 5, 1957, J.T. Manning and Charles W. Gasque, Jr. to Commissioner, no date, 62-A-1283, box 41, R.G. 30, Washington Federal Records Center, Suitland, Maryland.
29. A.F. Ghiglione to C.S. Woolsey, December 13, 1957, 62-A-1283, box 65, R.G. 30, Washington Federal Records Center, Suitland, Washington.
30. Ibid.

TRANSPORTATION AND THE NORTHERN ECONOMY,
ADAPTING THE 1956 FAHA TO THE TERRITORY AND THE CREATION
OF THE ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & PUBLIC WORKS

On January 23, 1957 the Region 10 office of the Bureau of Public Roads in Juneau submitted a cost estimate and funding request under the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to the Department of Commerce. The massive proposal included the fiscal years 1957 to 1969. Improvements to the primary highway system for the 12 year period included grading and paving; seal coating and crushed rock surfacing and guard rail installation; the erection of necessary buildings and the elimination of danger spots and the construction of bridges for a total of \$89,059,000. New work contemplated cost an estimated \$57,883,000, for a total of \$146,942,000 for the primary highway system.¹

Estimates for improving 1,803.9 miles of the secondary highways system for the same period amounted to \$61,729,800, while building 2,908.7 miles of new secondary highways came to \$28,778,000, for a total of \$90,507,800. At the same time, the Region 10 office submitted a detailed status of surveys on a territory-wide basis.²

The purpose of the proposal was to get federal and territorial officials to work together in establishing approved systems of primary, secondary, and urban highways meeting the requirements and conditions of federal aid highway legislation. Bureau officials recognized that a process of conferences and discussions, of additions, subtraction and modifications would be required to lay the groundwork for an acceptable highway plan. The Bureau then once again spelled out what it considered to be the consequences of Alaska's inclusion in the FAHA of 1956. These included, but

were not limited, to the decision making process. For example, the Governor of Alaska, the Territorial Highway Engineer and the Regional Engineer of the BPR in Alaska were to determine the highway systems on which federal aid apportionments were to be spent. Federal funds and those contributed by the territory could be expended directly by the Regional Engineer or in cooperation with the Territorial Board of Road Commissioners; they could be spent separately or in combination and regardless of the matching provisions of the FAHA. Most importantly, both funds could be used for maintenance of the eligible highway system under the same terms and conditions as for the construction of such a system. Finally, the BPR had inherited "the functions, duties, and authority pertaining to the construction, repair, and maintenance of roads, tramways, ferries, bridges, trails, and other works" in the territory from the Alaska Road Commission.³

The Bureau had decided to largely retain the administrative organization developed by the ARC. Region 10 headquarters were located in Juneau, Alaska's capital city, with two principal district headquarters at Anchorage and Fairbanks, and two sub-districts at Valdez and Nome. The Bureau had eliminated the Haines sub-district and included it in Juneau, while assigning the Cordova area to the Valdez district and the Seward area to the Anchorage district. Each of the organizational units was responsible for construction and maintenance in its geographical region.⁴

The territorial government had never maintained a highway department, due, in part, to restrictive federal legislation, the unwillingness of the Alaska legislature to impose an adequate system of taxation, and the expectation on the part of northern residents that road construction and maintenance were a federal responsibility. The legislature, however, had

created the elected office of Territorial Highway Engineer. His was largely an administrative organization with no highway equipment nor a construction or maintenance force. In fact, the ARC, and now the BPR, expended territorial highway funds under reimbursable agreements. Beginning in the 1950s, however, the Territorial Highway Engineer had started to build a professional force to investigate new highway routes and handle modest projects by contracts. The office also operated a small vehicle and passenger ferry between Juneau and Haines.⁵

As of January 1957, Alaska had roads totaling 4,030 miles, ranging from modern asphalt paved highways with a 24 foot surface to single-lane, graveled surface roads, as well as a small mileage of unsurfaced dirt roads. The ARC had maintained an additional 445 miles of trails during the winter by flagging them to guide travelers across the wilderness. The major highway network was located in southcentral Alaska, joining the coastal cities and villages of Homer, Seward, Anchorage, and Valdez with Fairbanks on the Tanana and the villages of Circle and Eagle on the Yukon River. This interconnected road system totaled 2,563 miles and joined the Alaska Highway leading through Canada to the contiguous states. The remaining roads were located adjacent to cities in southeastern Alaska, the Gulf of Alaska, Bristol Bay, Nome and the Seward Peninsula, and around villages located on interior rivers and creeks where gold mining was the principal activity. The Haines Highway, leading from Haines near the head of navigation in southeastern Alaska to the Canadian border where it joined with a route to northern Canada, Alaska, and the contiguous states was a notable exception.⁶

Formerly, the economy of southeastern Alaska had been dependent on the fishing industry, government employment, mining, and lumbering. Mining had

become insignificant, while pulp and lumber had gained appreciably on fishing. Tourism, although still important, had declined since the principal steamship line to Alaska had discontinued passenger service because of airline competition. Limited road systems developed in time around such cities as Ketchikan, Sitka, Wrangell, Juneau, and Skagway to serve local businesses and the population expansion to urban areas. The BPR determined that southeastern Alaska immediately needed cheap transportation to and from the contiguous states. This meant the creation of a ferry system capable of handling trucks, railroad cars, passenger vehicles and passengers. Private industry was studying the problem, but all agreed that interconnection of existing roads was not feasible without some ferry operations. Connecting Skagway, Juneau, Petersburg or Wrangell with a Canadian system leading to the contiguous states appeared to be practical only when the Canadians reached the northern part of British Columbia with planned highways along the coastal route. The BPR decided that improvements to existing roads and moderate expansion of existing roads was justified, but construction costs were high because of heavy forests, saturated soils of generally poor quality, and heavy rock work.⁶

Employment in the fisheries was the mainstay of Cordova's economy. Construction was under way on a route to the interior, and a single-lane road extended to Mile 39 along the roadbed of the abandoned Copper River and Northwestern Railroad. Since extensive oil exploration had begun along the Gulf of Alaska, a route to that area from Mile 39 would be justified if a strike occurred. Good coal deposits also were found in the region, but since no suitable harbors existed over much of the Gulf coast, resources would have to be shipped out over a road.¹⁷

In 1946, the ARC had begun construction of the Sterling Highway. A subsequent land rush to the western Kenai Peninsula had necessitated the building of numerous farm roads, as well as the extension of an important feeder road northward from Kenai along the coast. Lack of capital and markets considerably slowed the expected cultivation and utilization of the land. Settlers used the bituminous coal found in great abundance, and hydroelectric potential promised future developments. Fishermen were erecting homes along the coastline, thereby adding to the small permanent population, and several military installations had been established along the principal highways. The BPR recommended the paving of the primary roads and improvements on secondary ones.⁸

Seward, located on the east side of the Kenai Peninsula was the region's principal seaport as well as the southern terminus of the Alaska Railroad. A paved highway connected the city with Anchorage, but local roads, serving suburban populations, needed improvements to acceptable standards. The Anchorage-Matanuska and lower Susitna Valleys areas had experienced the most rapid growth in the territory. Two great military installations, Elmendorf Air Force Base and the Army's Fort Richardson, located near Anchorage, had contributed significantly to this expansion and provided a certain economic stability. While fishing continued to be of importance, gold mining, as elsewhere in Alaska, had declined precipitously. Coal mining in the Matanuska Valley supplied the energy needs of the military bases, while agriculture, particularly dairying, continued to grow modestly. Recreation was becoming more important, especially in the lower Susitna Valley, which offered good stocks of big game animals, and the many lakes enticed residents to build summer homes. Anchorage was the headquarters of the Alaska Railroad, and had also become a vital hub for inter-

national air routes across the pole to Europe and the Orient as well as to all points in the territory. Primary and secondary highways in the region were inadequate, maintenance costs were high because most road standards were low and the secondary system was unable to adequately handle peak loads throughout the Anchorage region.⁹

East of Anchorage is the Copper River Valley, connected to the seaport of Valdez by the Richardson Highway and to Anchorage by the Glenn Highway. Economic activities in the area were minimal since the closure of the Kennecott copper mines in 1938. Local inhabitants trapped fur bearing animals for cash income, or found seasonal employment with the BPR or its predecessor which maintained a major field depot in the highway community of Glennallen. Bureau engineers predicted that construction of a road into the Kennecott area would revitalize mineral prospecting, as would improvements and extensions of the Nabesna road into the headwaters of the White River. The Lake Louise area, off the Glenn Highway, was developing into a recreation area which called for improvements to the existing low-standard road which the military originally had built and which then had become a part of the highway system.¹⁰

The upper Tanana River economy was similar to that of the Copper River Valley. During the construction of the Alaska Highway in the 1940s, the Bureau established a field depot at Tok, at the junction of the Alaska and Glenn Highways some 5 miles southwest of the junction of the Tok and Tanana Rivers and 12 miles southeast of the village of Tanacross. A small community developed which expanded with the help of travelers and tourists, and the construction of a telephone line repeater station by the U.S. Army Signal Corps. In addition, the Customs Service opened an office there. Construction of the Taylor Highway had begun in the late 1940s. It extend-

ed northward to Eagle on the Yukon from the Alaska Highway and included a branch connecting at Boundary with the road to historic Dawson City in Canada's Yukon Territory. The graveled road had opened the Forty Mile mining area, and entrepreneurs hoped to open a gold dredging operation at Chicken. Recreational hunters used the road in the late fall, and the Bureau recommended improvements as traffic warranted.¹¹

Fairbanks and environs had experienced rapid growth during and after the war years. The military had built Ladd and Eielson Air Force Bases nearby, greatly influencing the expansion of the town. The University of Alaska had experienced a decline during the war. After 1945, enrollments increased, and in 1946 Congress established the Geophysical Institute. It soon earned an international reputation in the study of the earth and its physical environment at high latitudes, and in the training of manpower with leadership quality in related disciplines. Other research institutes followed, and the University quickly became one of the strongest economic pillars of Fairbanks. The construction of the Distant Early Warning line, a series of radar stations across the far north, had boosted the air transportation system in the city. Mining had continued after the war, and Fairbanks had become the hub for a highway extending south toward Nenana, and eventually to the Healy River Coal Fields and Mount McKinley National Park; northeast to the Yukon River via the Steese Highway; and westerly to Livengood on the route to Nome on the Elliott Highway; and southerly to Valdez on the Richardson Highway. Tourist traffic had become important for Fairbanks, and there were a few farms, including dairy operations. The Bureau recommended immediate improvements to the Steese Highways, and observed that other primary highways, especially those in the immediate vicinity of Fairbanks, were inadequate to effectively meet the present

traffic needs, while the secondary roads, serving the farms and suburbs, required continuous upgrading to higher standards. South on the Richardson Highway at Paxson Roadhouse construction was underway on the Denali Highway, designed to connect Mount McKinley National Park with the Alaska road system. It traversed an area of choice recreational and hunting opportunities as well as mineral potential. The Bureau expected this road to be used intensively, and predicted that paving might be necessary within the near future.¹²

A number of populated areas were not connected with Alaska's major highway network. On Kodiak Island, roads served the inhabitants of the city and the suburban areas, as well as an adjacent Naval base. Agriculture was minimal, although several ranches raised cattle. Fishing and its associated activities were the mainstay of the local economy. The existing road system was inadequate, and the rural routes needed extensive improvements or heavy maintenance. In the Bristol Bay area in southwestern Alaska, fishing was the only extensive industry, and there was some trapping in the winter. A road connected the village of Naknek on the coast with a military airbase which also served civilian traffic in the area. Teamsters freighted water-borne supplies over this road, including large quantities of petroleum products. Low-standard roads at Dillingham served the fishing community, adjacent canneries, and a federal hospital. A spur road under construction led to a potential mineral and recreation area. All roads needed extensive repairs and improvements. In Alaska's interior, the Flat-Ophir mining area had two small road systems, each originating at navigable rivers and leading to various creeks with placer mining operations. The Bureau observed that these systems were adequate if normally maintained based on the gradual declining mining activities. The

Wiseman mining area, located in the southern foothills of the Brooks Range, paralleled the Flat-Ophir mining district. So did the Ruby area on the Yukon River. The Bureau stated that road maintenance and improvement operations varied from year to year in conformance with the ups and downs of the mining industry.¹³

In the Nome area and on the Seward Peninsula modest mining activities continued. The principal road system originated at Nome and served a number of adjacent creeks. Other, relatively short roads originated at the seacoast and also served placer mining operations. Some roads needed improvements, while others required only normal maintenance. Construction on a highway to replace a narrow-gauge tram had started, financed by territorial funds. The Bureau recommended that it be completed. Roads in the Bethel region in southwestern Alaska, near the mouth of the Kuskokwim River, enabled the village to reach fuel tanks, the hospital, and airfield. Bethel served as a supply center for the villages of the region. The economy was based on river freighting and trapping. The Bureau observed that sand furnished the major construction material. Unfortunately, it eroded rapidly in the wind and rain, and therefore, required the application of stabilization techniques.¹⁴

Finally, oil companies conducted exploration drilling in many areas of the territory. A discovery along an existing or proposed highway was certain to result in a construction boom similar to that triggered by the military build-up. Additionally, tourism promised to become increasingly important, and the territorial government had recognized this and aided promotional activities. Highway improvements were certain to help tourism make the recreation industry a substantial revenue producer.¹⁵

The Bureau had provided a comprehensive overview of Alaska's highway and road system, and indicated a future plan of action. By early January, 1957, it also had decided that the territory should pay its matching funds at the beginning of each fiscal year with payment no later than July 15. Bureau officials realized, however, that such lump-sum payment might create a fiscal hardship for the territorial government. After negotiations lasting for a couple of months, the Bureau and the territory concluded an agreement which allowed quarterly payments of territorial matching funds. For the fiscal year 1958 the territory had to pay \$1,314,159.90 in four equal installments of \$328,539.98, the first due on or before July 1, 1957, the second by October 1, 1957, the third by January 1, 1958, and the final payment by April 1, 1958.¹⁶ Nothing prevented the territory, however, from paying the matching funds at an earlier date.

A month later, on February 20, territorial officials met with Bureau representatives in Juneau and agreed on the allocations and fund expenditures for the 1957-1958 construction season. For territory-wide general maintenance, surveys and plans, farm, access and industrial roads, and reconstruction of danger spots on paved highways and improvements of existing gravel roads the officials budgeted \$5,350,000; the first judicial division was to receive \$2,825,000; the second \$675,000; the third \$5,969,000; and the fourth \$4,030,000. Added to this were \$2,460,000 in forest highway funds for the Tongass National Forest, and \$700,000 for a military access road on Kodiak Island for a total of \$22,009,000. On February 26, 1957, territorial and Bureau officials agreed on a federal aid highway system for Alaska. Amended several times, it included a primary system of 1,959.1 miles, and 2,156.8 miles of "A" class and 1,027.9 miles

of "B" class secondary roads for a total of 5,143.8 miles eligible for federal aid highway funding.¹⁷

On March 8, 1957, A.F. Ghiglione, the Acting Regional Engineer for BPR Region 10 submitted Alaska's federal aid primary and secondary projects to Washington headquarters for approval. The program recommended by the territory applied to fiscal years 1957 and 1958 federal aid apportionments. Four listed projects, namely Fairbanks-Nenana, Section C for \$1,146,000, Glacier Highway, Tee Harbor to Eagle River for \$1,275,000, Mitkof Highway, Power House to Deep Landing for \$600,000, and Houston-Willow for \$300,000 for a total of \$3,321,000 would have to be funded from 1959 federal aid apportionments because they exceeded the 1957 and 1958 funds available. Ghiglione intended to use \$600,000 available from remaining Interior appropriations in the 1957 work season. There were several unusual items in the two program submissions for fiscal years 1957 and 1958. For 1957, there were maintenance funds budgeted, necessary to supplement Interior Department funds for the remainder of the fiscal year. Ghiglione pointed out that in previous years the territory had appropriated these monies, but under the FAHA these were now designated for matching purposes. A field maintenance depot repair shop, lost through fire, had to be replaced, and three pioneer roads were to be constructed by government forces in the initial phases. When warranted, improvements to these roads would be performed by contract labor. For 1958, funds had been programmed for maintenance of the primary and secondary systems as authorized by the FAHA of 1956. Traffic counts in the vicinity of Anchorage and Fairbanks had indicated the need for additional lanes on four primary highways and surveys and design, therefore, had been budgeted for 30 miles. Since the facilities at the Gardiner maintenance camp were so inadequate, budget

items provided for a duplex residence, garage and warm storage, and water and sewer systems. This work represented the continuation of a program initiated several years ago under the Alaska Road Commission and approved by Congress to replace a few obsolete and inadequate maintenance camps each year. On one existing contract, a 24' subgrade width had to be brought to 28' to meet primary highway standards. Ghiglione proposed to do so by utilizing the 25 percent increase clause by a change order. He realized that the 1957 program submission did not meet normal Bureau standards, but he asked that the required exemptions be granted speedily since work had to be released to the districts and the contractors at the earliest possible date "if the 1957 construction season is to proceed without interruption." A few days later, on March 14, the BPR approved the first Alaska program of projects involving federal aid funds for the primary and secondary systems. Together with the approval, Ghiglione received a lesson in bureaucratic procedures. The Bureau's Assistant Commissioner, G.M. Williams, pointed out that "we have separated the projects in your submission into two separate programs," namely one for "Federal-aid primary funds...and the other for Federal-aid secondary funds" since "separate programs are required for each class of Federal-aid funds." Programs for each class of funds were handled on a cumulative basis, Williams continued, so there was no need for separate fiscal year programs, "and the separate fiscal year listings included" with Ghiglione's submission had been combined "into a single program for each class of Federal-aid funds." The federal aid primary funds, as approved, contained 19 projects for a total estimated cost of \$9,554,000 with a request for federal funds in the amount of \$8,598,600. Fifteen of these projects involved new highway construction, 2 were projects for general maintenance work, one for reconstruction of

various substandard sections of the system, and one for surveys on four primary system routes. The Bureau assigned numbers to these projects covering maintenance, reconstruction and surveys in order to establish project identities for record and accounting purposes. The assigned numbers had been taken from those in the established series for the primary system which had not yet been used. The project numbers assigned to the reconstruction and survey projects were for temporary identity only, for example, the agreement numbers (57) and (58) indicated the fiscal year funds annually set aside for maintenance purposes.¹⁸

One item covered reconstruction and improvement of substandard sections of various locations on the primary system. The Bureau had approved it as submitted in order to avoid any delay in getting the work started. Williams instructed Ghiglione, however, to promptly separate the item into its component parts, and setting up individual projects covering the reconstruction work for each route, or for each route section on those so divided. Each separate improvement required its own project number applying to the route and section on which the particular project was located. Projects on a system-wide basis, however, were not to be programmed for any work except that classified as maintenance. Ghiglione also had improperly programmed preliminary engineering work such as surveys, materials investigations and design of future projects on several primary routes. Nevertheless, the Bureau had approved it as submitted in order to avoid delays. In this case also the project had to be divided into its individual parts by establishing a separate project covering the preliminary engineering work for each route involved, or for each route section on those thus divided. Where the improvement of only a part of the route or route section was anticipated it was preferable that the preliminary

engineering project could cover a part or all of a route section proposed for future construction under more than one project. Williams informed Ghiglione that the submissions to cover the proposed reconstruction or new construction of maintenance section garages, living quarters and utilities had been referred to the Bureau's general counsel for determination on whether or not these items were eligible for funding, and if so, how these should be programmed. Until these questions had been settled, approval action had been deferred. The Bureau made identical suggestions for the federal aid secondary funds which contained 14 projects at a total estimated cost of \$6,393,900 with a request for federal funds in the amount of \$5,753,700. Ten of these involved new highway construction, two general maintenance work and one for the reconstruction and improvement of substandard sections at various locations on the secondary system.¹⁹

Ghiglione realized that the informal procedures of the Alaska Road Commission had ended. Bureau procedures were well-established and formal. Washington headquarters informed him on March 14 that personnel activities were decentralized to Region 10 on September 16, 1956 for all positions except that of Regional Engineer and the Assistant to the Regional Engineer while payroll functions were redelegated to Region 10 on January 7, 1957. With the September 16, 1956 transfer to the Department of Commerce, the Alaska Road Commission had lost its separate identity.²⁰

Implementing the federal aid system in Alaska occurred step by step. The Bureau soon expressed concern over the matter of obligating and lapsing federal aid funds apportioned to Alaska. The first was of immediate concern, because under existing statutes reporting obligations incurred in Alaska against federal aid funds would be on a different basis than for those reported for the various states. There, the Bureau reported as

obligations against FAHA funds the engineer's estimates of the cost of the work after approval by the regional engineer. The territory, however, did not submit federal aid projects which would require approval or disapproval by the Bureau. Therefore, obligations could only be reported after contracts for projects had been signed by the Bureau and contractors or vendors. Would it be possible, the Bureau asked its general counsel, to consider agreements between the BPR and the territory for completion of projects sufficient to obligate funds? Lapsing of funds represented a similar problem. The FAHA provided that the execution of a formal agreement constituted expenditures for lapsing purposes. For example, in the various states the Bureau might have approved a project and reported it as an obligation, but if it did not continue to formal agreement, then those funds, under certain conditions, would lapse. In Alaska a contract between the Bureau and a contractor could probably not be cancelled by the lapsing provision in the FAHA, "but if there were funds...allotted to the project but not expended for engineering services those funds could lapse." The Bureau stated that if a contract between it and a contractor indeed obligated funds, and legal opinion so determined, then the lapsing provision would not apply. General Counsel, C.W. Enfield quickly decided that the wording of the FAHA of 1956 required that the fiscal arrangements about reporting obligations and lapsing of federal aid apportioned to Alaska be no different from the fiscal arrangements applicable "to our normal Federal-Aid operations." In short, except for such details as matching funds for Alaska, special deposit of funds in the Federal Treasury, and permissive use of funds for maintenance, the federal aid program in Alaska was to "be on the same footing as it is for all the States."²¹

At the end of April, top Bureau officials met to further discuss the federal aid program in Alaska. Three issues were discussed, but agreement reached on only one, namely that a highway planning survey program had to be established in the territory patterned on those existing in the various states. It was to be financed by using 1.5 percent of each class of funds for any given year, and prepare detailed work programs. Although it would be advantageous to assign the 10 percent territorial matching funds solely to secondary maintenance projects, with any surplus used in the primary program, the regional engineer in Alaska had objected. He desired to apply the 10 percent fund on each project as programmed, so no changes were made. Officials agreed with the legal counsel that the type of agreements to be used in Alaska for obligating and lapsing funds be uniform with those used in the contiguous states, but a proposed format still needed to be developed by the Bureau in cooperation with the legal department.²²

In the meantime, the Bureau had decided to replace acting Regional Engineer Ghiglione with a long-time Bureau employee. It is possible that officials were uneasy with Ghiglione, the former Commissioner of Roads for Alaska and head of the Alaska Road Commission. They knew that the former ARC had enjoyed the reputation as being the only federal agency in the territory with full decision making power in the field. The Bureau operated differently. It was highly structured and bureaucratic with control exercised from its Washington, D.C. headquarters. Unlike the former ARC, it had the reputation for strictly following rules and regulations. By replacing Ghiglione, Bureau officials undoubtedly expected a smoother territorial transition to the federal aid system.

Ghiglione knew that he would be replaced, but had become concerned over the long delay in the selection of a Regional Engineer. On March 11,

1957, Commissioner Curtiss notified him that a replacement had finally been selected and that he would be transferred to Washington headquarters in the newly formed Office of Operations. Ghiglione was to either work in connection with the Bureau's foreign or federal domain programs, but no definite decision had yet been made on that score. The Bureau expected Ghiglione to start on his new assignment in the latter part of April. Ghiglione was relieved, and asked that once in Washington he be allowed to return to Juneau in order to permanently transfer his family after the end of the school year. He mentioned that he had not yet been able to sell his house "and the many ramifications of the move after our long residence makes my return to assist the family almost a necessity. Ghiglione continued his distinguished career. From 1957 to 1958 he served as Chief, Foreign Projects Division, Office of Operations. From 1958 to 1959 he was Regional Engineer for Region 15, responsible for all direct federal highway construction east of the Rocky Mountains, including national park roads, parkways, and forest highways with an annual construction volume worth about \$45 million. From 1959 to 1970, he served as Deputy Director for Operations for the Bureau of Public Roads. He retired in 1970 and became a consultant to the U.S. Federal Highway Administrator WAE for International Highway negotiations involving Canada and Latin America.²³

Edgar H. Swick, who replaced Ghiglione in March 1957, was 47 years of age. He had graduated in 1935 with a bachelor of science degree in civil engineering from the University of Maryland and started his career with the BPR as Junior Highway Engineer that same year in Austin, Texas. Promoted to Assistant Highway Engineer in 1937, the Bureau moved him to Baton Rouge, Louisiana. He steadily moved up the career ladder and was promoted to District Engineer in Oklahoma City in the late summer of 1955. Along the

way, Swick had acquired a reputation for his ability to quickly grasp the important facts of administrative and engineering problems and effectively solve them. Possessed of a pleasing personality and handling public relations very well, he also had gained an intimate knowledge of the laws and regulations governing the functioning of the Bureau of Public Roads. Woodrow Johansen, Fairbanks district engineer who worked closely with Swick described him as being "a black Irishman," of average height, "broad shoulders, heavy black eyebrows and black wavy hair. He had the most piercing eyes--you felt he was seeing right through you." Johansen recalled that Swick at first gave the impression of being a rigid task master, but found him "willing to listen if you had valid arguments." Johansen formed a lasting friendship with the man and considered him somebody "you were proud to know."²⁴ His superiors felt that Swick was the right person to fill the position of Regional Engineer in Alaska where he would have to manage the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Alaska highway system and speedily fit the territory into the federal aid system.²⁵

While the Bureau struggled to integrate Alaska into the FAH program and adjust to its new role as the territory's highway department, Alaska's lawmakers had become interested in the subject of transportation. Victor Fischer, elected to the territorial house in 1957, was a professional town planner who had served as planning director for Anchorage from 1952 to 1955 and executive secretary of the League of Alaskan Cities from 1953 to 1956. In the latter two capacities he had become vitally interested in the development of the territory's surface transportation system. He soon realized that the uncertain annual Congressional appropriations to the Alaska Road Commission would never allow the long-range planning and

financial stability required to develop an integrated transportation system. Together with others, he worked with Delegate E.L. Bartlett to have Alaska included in the FAHA system. The efforts bore fruit in 1956, as already recounted elsewhere. Now, as a member of the territorial house Fischer wanted Alaska to create a highway department of its own in order to set priorities and spend federal aid funds accordingly. Early in 1957, he started to work with Bureau officials to write legislation to achieve that purpose, and by the middle of February, a draft was ready for comments and suggestions of interested parties.²⁶

Speed was of the essence by that time since the measure had to be introduced by early March in order to meet legislative deadlines. The first draft was nine pages long and was "merely the basic skeleton for a highway department." The joint committee of the territorial senate and house which requested the review realized that "greater ramifications eventually will be necessary," but asserted that the measure did cover the principal powers required by the highway engineer, such as right-of-way acquisition and condemnation, research, and financing. Bureau officials reviewed the draft and made innumerable suggestions, but all commented that more time was needed "to do full justice to the subject" which required "a thorough...and critical detailed study."

On March 11, 1957, Fischer introduced "An Act Creating the Alaska Highway and Public Works Department." Over the next few days, house members offered amendments to his bill, and on March 19, the house passed the measure on a vote of 19 to 4. The senate passed the bill soon thereafter with but one amendment in which the house concurred. On March 28, the house transmitted the Alaska Highway & Public Works Department to the governor for his signature and it became law on April 1, 1957.²⁷

The Alaska Highway & Public Works Act of 1957 created a Highway Division to carry out a planning, construction and maintenance program, and a Public Works Division to perform other public works planning and construction. The need for such legislation arose with Alaska's 1956 inclusion in the FAHA of that year, and the act also contained assent provisions to the federal aid highway legislation as required by the original law of 1916. Article I of Title I of the Alaska Highway and Public Works Act of 1957 declared that the legislature intended that specific details of the administration of the act be determined by rules and regulations. Article II created a five member Alaska Highway and Public Works Board appointed by the governor. That board appointed the commissioner and had control and supervision over the department. Article III specified the duties and powers of the board, such as rights-of-way, access control, acceptance and disposition of federal funds, and the authority to sign contracts, among other matters. Article IV enumerated the duties and powers of the commissioner in his supervision and administration of the department.²⁸

Article I of Title II dealt with the Alaska Highway Division which, under a director, supervised approved highway planning, construction and maintenance. Article II dealt with assent to federal aid as required by the 1916 act, and stated that municipalities could participate in the program. Article III vested authority to designate the Alaska Highway System in the board and also gave it power to control vehicle size and weight and determine safe speed limits and discussed uniform marking and signs. Article IV was entitled "Highway Planning and Construction." It contained provisions for standard plans and specifications; the adoption of master highway plans by municipalities and required that a construction program be submitted by the director to the commissioner for annual

presentation to the board. It also dealt with highway development research, traffic surveys, inspection and testing of materials, and road closures for construction. Article V dealt with control of access, Articles VI and VII with finance and general provisions. Articles I through V of Title III established the Alaska Public Works Division and specified its multitudinous duties and powers, while Articles I through V contained miscellaneous provisions, such as land acquisition, eminent domain proceedings, penalties for damage to public works, award of construction contracts, force accounts, contracts for construction work, informal and formal bidding procedures, contract awards, and acquisition and disposition of property and sale of lands. Finally, it repealed all previous acts inconsistent with the Alaska Highway and Public Works Act of 1957, and provided for an effective date of April 1, 1957.²⁹

By the middle of April, the governor had appointed one member from each judicial division and a member at large to the Alaska Highway & Public Works Board. Frank Metcalf, elected highway engineer in the fall of 1956, became acting commissioner of the new department, while Lee D. Hubbard assumed the position of acting director of the division of highways, while Metcalf filled the position of superintendent for the division of public works. Cort B. Howard became chief engineer.³⁰

Regional Engineer E.H. Swick had attended the organizational meeting of the Alaska Highway & Public Works Department on April 17 to 19, 1957. Afterwards, he concluded that it was "most apparent that any assumption by the Board of normal highway department responsibilities will come slowly. While we are making efforts to have the Department assume responsibility for right-of-way acquisition, it is my analysis that even this function is too great an undertaking at this time." Swick assured Bureau officials

that his office would continue its efforts to build the territorial organization "into a going highway department" but he did not expect to make any rapid progress.³¹

The Alaska Highway & Public Works Board met again from July 15 to 17 in Anchorage. Members discussed a wide range of topics, including right-of-way acquisition, the effects of highway construction on salmon spawning and construction and maintenance of through routes in urban renewal areas, a comprehensive ferry system for southeastern Alaska and highway access to that region through Canada, and the feasibility of a road to McGrath. Swick told board members that the territory had to finance the construction of farm access and non-system roads and that the BPR would maintain these on a reimbursable basis. Board members pointed out that Alaskans requested these roads in large numbers, but the legislature did not appropriate sufficient funds to meet these demands. For most of the three days, board members listened to pleas from various interest groups. All wanted roads constructed. Al Anderson of the Resource Development Board requested that the territory contribute \$100,000 toward the estimated \$500,000 cost of building 2.17 miles of road extending to Blue Lake at Sitka to allow access for the construction of a dam at the lake. The project was to provide water for the proposed \$55 million Sitka Pulp Mill and hydroelectric power for the town. The board agreed to contribute the funds.³²

Glen Briggs and three of his neighbors from Chugiak wanted to know the status of the Eagle River loop road. The board told them that the BPR had been unable to secure the minimum width right-of-way on the projected location because owners with improvements close to the road had objected. E.J. Bailey wanted the rest of the Sterling Highway to Homer paved, and

Claire O. Banks, representing the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce, urged the construction of three new highway routes, namely from Anchorage through the Susitna Valley to the Kuskokwim and lower Yukon areas, and to Mount McKinley Park and Fairbanks; and from Iliamna to Dillingham with a ferry connection to Homer. George Shannon, Anchorage City Manager, appealed to the board for improvement and maintenance of through highways within the city. So it went for three days. In addition, each board member presented requests and petitions from his judicial division. The board adjourned on July 17 after deciding to hold all future meetings in Juneau and commending Regional Engineer Swick for his concern with the problems experienced by the new organization and his willingness to attend meetings and offer his cooperation.³³

The board next met from October 28 to 31 in Juneau. The meeting followed the format established in Anchorage in July. Again, representatives from various organizations and individuals presented construction wishlists to the board members. For example, Sitkans desired the development of an arterial system through the city, while Fairbanksans supported the Phillips Field and Chena Hot Springs Road. Jerry Miller, Juneau's city engineer, and Rod Darnell, a member of the Planning Commission of that city, presented a proposal for an Outer Drive, that is, a through highway around the business district of Juneau and asked the board to grant the necessary funds for the surveying and planning work. The mayor of Haines and Felix Toner, a consulting engineer, representing Haines and Skagway, stated that while the legislature had appropriated money and that funds had been obtained from Alaska Public Works, \$27,500 was needed to complete Haines harbor and Skagway needed an additional \$46,000. Once again, board members presented the needs of their respective judicial divisions, and

Regional Engineer Swick discussed the Bureau's proposed 1959 program. He stated that his office now furnished the territorial highway engineer with all fiscal documents enabling board members to keep informed on the current status of the various projects. The board also agreed that it would deal with all petitions for construction or extension of farm and industrial roads since these no longer qualified for federal aid funds after the end of fiscal year 1958. This relieved the Bureau of the responsibility of receiving, documenting, and investigating such petitions. At the request of Swick, the board also took steps to establish planning and right-of-way departments.³⁴

Subsequently to the October meeting, the board and the Bureau agreed on priorities and a program for the 1959 fiscal year. In November, the Bureau announced that a total of \$14,800,000 in federal aid monies, which included the 10 percent mandatory territorial matching contribution, would be available for 1959. This amount was distributed among the four judicial divisions under a formula first suggested by Swick and then adopted by the board which included the size of the area, total existing road mileage, population, vehicle registration, fuel tax receipts and an analysis of the needs of each division. The first division was to receive \$2,246,000 federal aid funds for maintenance, surveys and construction, and an additional \$1,840,000 for forest highway maintenance, surveys and construction in the Tongass National Forest for a total of \$4,086,000; the second was slated for \$837,000, the third for \$7,972,000 and the fourth for \$4,353,000. There was an additional \$6,545,000 for construction work in 1958 which included \$2,500,000 of carryover work on previously let contracts, and \$4,045,000 of construction already programmed and funded but where contracts had not yet been advertised or awarded.³⁵

The Bureau cautioned the board not to publicize the dollar amounts programmed for specific projects. The total costs established by the Bureau and then approved by the board were only the best estimates available. Final expenditures on any project could be greater or smaller after full preparations of plans and engineering costs, while high or low bids further changed the picture. Once construction began, much minor shifting of funds from project to project usually was necessary to accommodate the variables, but this was always difficult to explain to the public. It was simplest, therefore, "to not publicize the amounts." Furthermore, the Bureau had not broken the total funds into primary and secondary because this was a complex matter unless one fully understood the federal aid system--and few citizens did. The Bureau also told the board that "sums programmed for right of way acquisition were deliberately not mentioned by name in the hope that the public would not be drawn into the controversies."³⁶ Obviously, the Bureau feared human greed and wanted to avoid acquisition of prospective right-of-way properties by speculators who then would hold out for the highest price possible, knowing that a pot of money was available.

The 1959 program was in place, but the board was unhappy. The amounts of federal aid Alaska received was inadequate "to press forward with a program of new road construction...." The board complained to the Secretary of Commerce that most of the funds annually allocated were apparently "to be used for reconstruction and maintenance of existing roads." Alaska's development, however, demanded new road construction. The territory's highway system consisted of only about 4,000 miles. It was clear "that resources cannot be developed, settlement encouraged, and progress had until and unless the road system is pushed out from existing limited

arterial highways." The board reminded the secretary that Alaska's needs were "not altogether civilian. We stand in the front line of defense" which would be aided by more roads. Alaskans confronted "the immediate future in troubled spirit because for more than 50 years we have been starved for road funds" expect for a few years after World War II. The board assured the secretary that the resolution recently adopted by the Alaska Chamber of Commerce calling for an additional annual appropriation of \$10 million for each of the next five years represented the wishes of all inhabitants. Furthermore, "we are convinced that it is the duty of the federal government to assist us to a more considerable extent during the next few years." It explained this duty by stating that the federal government owned more than 99 percent of Alaska's land and because "a territory is pretty much a ward of Washington." The League of Alaska Cities agree with the board and the chamber and asked that the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways be extended to the north since the military used the system extensively. The league also asked for an increase in the area factor from the existing one-third to one-half on which federal aid funds for Alaska were calculated, in part.³⁶

Louis S. Rothschild, the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation acknowledged the plea from the league. He conceded that increased funds for highway development could undoubtedly be obtained by an increase in the area factor in the Alaska apportionment formula. Rothschild pointed out, however, that Alaska only had to provide 10 percent matching funds for federal aid monies. The contiguous states had to furnish 50 percent matching funds "except in public land States where the Federal share is increased on the basis of public land area." Before Congress changed the apportionment formula for Alaska, the territory had to show that current